MĀKAʻIKAʻI KE KŌLEA

TRAVEL WRITING AND THE "IMAGINED HAWAIʻI"

IN THE LATE NINETEENTH CENTURY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAIʻI AT MĀNOA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

HISTORY

DECEMBER 2016

Noah Patterson Hanohano Dolim

Thesis Committee:

Noelani Arista, Chairperson
John Rosa
Suzanna Reiss

Keywords: travel, travel writing, tourism, colonialism, imperialism, Hawaiʻi, 19th century

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the help and guidance of others. First, I would like to acknowledge my committee members, Dr. Noelani Arista, Dr. John Rosa, and Dr. Suzanna Reiss. Thank you Dr. Arista for serving as chairperson and keeping me on track. I am very appreciative of the time and effort my committee has contributed to guiding me through this process, from attending meetings to reading and commenting on drafts. Serving on a graduate committee is a commitment that takes time away from their own research projects.

I began different parts of the research and writing process in my various graduate seminars throughout the past two years. Invaluable experiences in seminars with professors and peers have contributed both directly and indirectly to this thesis. Again, much gratitude to Dr. Arista and Dr. Reiss, as well as both Dr. David Hanlon and Dr. Matthew Lauzon. A special mahalo to Alexander Mawyer from the Center of Pacific Island Studies (CPIS). As the term project for Dr. Mawyer's PACS 603 class, we were tasked with drafting a thesis proposal for our research. He was the first person to read and comment on my proposal, which became the introduction chapter of this thesis. I am also very thankful for my friend and peer Sarah "Sawah" Tamashiro, who read drafts and supported me in the late stages of my research and writing.

The use of Hawaiian language sources are integral to my research. During my time at UH Mānoa, I was honored to be a haumana in ka papa ʻōlelo of Kumu Kaliko Baker and Kumu Lalepa Koga. In Kumu Lalepa's class, I became familiar with Samuel M. Kamakau's nūpepa articles via the publication *Ke Kumu Aupuni*. Additionally, I am extremely grateful to another friend and peer, Kalikoaloha Martin, who provided comments and input on my translations (any translation errors in this thesis are my own).

I could not have endured and completed this journey without the endless support of my ʻohana on Oʻahu, Hawaiʻi Island, and Molokaʻi. Your moral encouragement and uplifting words throughout the entirety of this process is truly appreciated. I am glad I could make all of you proud. Aloha nō.

I am immensely indebted to you all, mahalo piha iā ʻoukou pākahi a pau.

Me ka haʻahaʻa,
Noah Patterson Hanohano Dolim

ABSTRACT

This thesis primarily focuses on the colonial and imperial aspects of travel writing about Hawai‘i produced in the late 19th century (1870s and 1890s). I argue that narrative themes found in these travel writings created the vision of the "Imagined Hawai‘i" for the consumption of white (primarily Euro-American) visitors and settlers. Travel writers invited visitors and settlers to a virgin landscape of agricultural opportunity, while constantly questioning the civility of Kānaka ‘Ōiwi and the viability of the Hawaiian monarchy. The culmination of these narrative themes suggested that Hawai‘i was the rightful inheritance of Euro-American settlers, and that both Hawai‘i and Kānaka ‘Ōiwi would be better off under American control. The historiography of travel accounts is dominated by European and Euro-American writers, therefore, I consider mo‘olelo huaka‘i (stories of travel) of Kānaka ‘Ōiwi as an important but missing space of discourse. By doing so, I show that Kānaka ‘Ōiwi engaged in travel much differently than their Euro-American and European counterparts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

-Introduction-
Ka Haʻalele (The Departure)

During the fall, thousands of kōlea (*Pluvialis dominica*) make their annual departure from the unforgiving arctic tundras, flying across the Pacific to spend the winter and early spring in Hawaiʻi.[1] Thin and weary upon arrival, the kōlea eat from the ʻāina and replenish their health throughout their stay. One can see kōlea almost anywhere in the Hawaiian Islands; picking on bugs in grassy parks, hunting near the ocean, or strolling on golf courses. By the time the kōlea are ready to leave Hawaiʻi and return to the tundra in the late spring, they have gone through some physical changes. As a result of gorging on hosts of insects, their bodies are full and recharged. Most noticeable is their change in plumage, from white and light brown to black and speckled golden-yellow. However, not all kōlea leave Hawaiʻi, some choose to stay permanently and are seen year around. The majority of kōlea make the long flight back to their home where they spend the summer months, waiting to return to Hawaiʻi again in the fall.

Kōlea is also a metaphor, reflected in the definition of the word and in various ʻōlelo noʻeau (proverbs or wise sayings). The figurative definition of kōlea is "a scornful reference to foreigners who come to Hawaii and become prosperous, and then leave with their wealth, just as the plover arrives thin in the fall each year, fattens up, and leaves."[2] This same thought is also echoed in ʻōlelo noʻeau such as "Aia kēkē na hulu o ka umauma hoʻi ke kōlea i Kahiki e hānau ai. *When the feathers on the breast darken [because of fatness] the plover goes back to Kahiki to breed*. A person comes here, grows prosperous, and goes away without a thought to the source of his prosperity" (ON 56).[3]

---

[1] Also known as the Pacific golden plover.

[2] Mary Kawena Pukui and Samuel H. Elbert, *Hawaiian Dictionary*, (Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press, 1986), 162. An alternate figurative definition of kōlea is to "repeat, boast...Kōlea ke kōlea i kona inoa iho, the kōlea just says his own name." The word "kōlea" is an onomatopoeia of the "ko-lea" call of the kōlea bird. Kōlea also refers to "one who claims friendship or kinship that does not exist."

[3] Mary Kawena Pukui, *ʻŌlelo Noʻeau: Hawaiian Proverbs and Poetical Sayings*, (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1983), 9. "ʻAi no ke kōlea a momona hoʻi i Kahiki. *The plover eats until fat, then returns to the land from which it came.* Said of a foreigner who comes to Hawaiʻi, makes money, and departs to his homeland to enjoy his wealth." (ON 86), 12. "Kōlea kau āhua, a uliuli ka umauma hoʻi i Kahiki. *Plover that perches on the mound, wait till its breast darkens, then departs for Kahiki*. The darkening of the breast is a sign that a plover is fat. It flies to these islands from Alaska in the fall and departs in the spring, arriving thin and hungry and departing fat. Applied to a person who comes here, acquires wealth, and departs." (ON 182), 22.

The title of this thesis, *Māka'ika'i Ke Kōlea*, describes the behavior of kōlea, both bird and traveler. Māka'ika'i is to visit, to stroll, to tour, or to look (as in sight-seeing).[4] Additionally, the term "po'e māka'ika'i" refers to visitors, sight-seers, tourists, or spectators.[5] Another critique of foreigners' behaviors is found in the phrase "Haole kī kōlea" (plover-shooting white man), which was "said in astonishment and horror at the white man's shooting of plovers contrasting with the laborious Hawaiian methods of catching plovers, a way of saying that white people are strange and different."[6]

These "strange and different" kōlea are the main subjects of my research. The purpose of this thesis is to critically examine the relationships between travel and colonial narratives by analyzing texts produced by travel writers in the late 19th century. The language used by European and Euro-American writers reflected the negative attitudes and stereotyped perceptions towards the non-white, indigenous peoples and lands they came into contact with. Their production of "authoritative knowledge" of Hawai'i and Kānaka 'Ōiwi, based on ethno-centric, paternalistic, and often racist views, came to inform American (and European) publics.[7]

In the context of American imperial and colonial encounters with the "Other", scholar of American Studies and History, Matthew Frye Jacobsen, stated that it was the "American *idea* of foreign peoples" that "framed the social and political relations between the United States and its

[4] I chose the hua 'ōlelo (word) "māka'ika'i" because it is more specific to tourism and tourists than words such a holo (to run or travel), hele (to go to move), or huaka'i (a trip, a journey, to travel).

[5] Māka'ika'i is more specific than the more commonly used word "malihini", whereas malihini could be a stranger, foreigner, guest, or a tourist. The concept of "malihini" is interesting because it is often used in a complimentary relation with the word "kama'āina", which means "land child" or "child of the land". Kama'āina can also mean familiar or acquainted; a person is kama'āina with another person or to a place. There is a common assumption that malihini means a foreigner from outside of Hawai'i, but malihini could be a person who is not kama'āina to a specific island, district, or even ahupua'a. The malihini-kama'āina binary relies on the situational context. For example, a Kanaka might be kama'āina to Mānoa, O'ahu but malihini to Pālolo, O'ahu; these two valleys are right next to eachother. The same Kanaka would be kama'āina (in a more general view) to O'ahu but malihini to Moloka'i.

[6] "Haole" and "kōlea" are equivalent in certain usages and contexts. The word "haole" can refer to any type of foreigner or stranger to Hawai'i—regardless of race. However, the etymology and connotation of the word has been fluid and often a source of debate, historically and contemporarily. At least through the 19th century until the present, "haole" has been synonymous with phenotypically white Europeans or white Americans, no matter if they were visitors or citizens. In contemporary usage, some people embrace the term, while others do not. There is also the argument that "haole" is a description of person's attitude, for example a "mainland haole" (negative connation) versus a "haole from the mainland" (positive/neutral connotation).

[7] I use the term Kanaka 'Ōiwi (singular)/Kānaka 'Ōiwi (plural) in reference to Native Hawaiians, the indigenous peoples of Hawai'i. In regards to the usage of 'ōlelo Hawai'i in this thesis, I refrain from italicizing Hawaiian words in the effort to not characterize 'ōlelo as a foreign language. In some of the sources presented throughout this essay, especially from nūpepa (Hawaiian language newspapers), the 'okina (glottal stop) and kahakō (macron) are not included, thus I do not add them in. For example, Hawai'i without an 'okina—Hawaii; and Kalākaua without a kahakō—Kalakaua.

economic participants from around the globe; and these relations…had the power to generate a new round of images or to put a new spin on old ones."[8] The same could be said in the way Europeans imagined the peoples in their own overseas colonies. Travel writers were producers, shapers, and perpetuators of this authoritative knowledge; as they made circuits between metropole and periphery, they constantly recycled and reproduced these narratives and tropes in their literature. Through repetition, the narratives became real and "true" to the reading audience. These colonial narratives also had greater implications in shaping views of Hawai'i and Native Hawaiians in the 1890s and early 1900s, as Hawai'i was forcefully transformed from a sovereign Kingdom to an American territory. Travel writing had always been a space of political commentary, but the stakes of colonial narratives meant much more at the turn of the century.

In this thesis, I argue that narrative themes found in late 19th century travel writing created an "Imagined Hawai'i" for the consumption of white (primarily Euro-American) visitors and settlers. This "Imagined Hawai'i" was constructed by narrative themes within two categories: landscape and Kānaka 'Ōiwi. These various narratives invited travelers to a virgin landscape of agricultural opportunity, while constantly questioning both the civility of Native Hawaiians and the viability of the Hawaiian monarchy. The culmination of these narrative themes suggested that Hawai'i was the rightful inheritance or destiny of white settlers, and that Hawai'i and Kānaka 'Ōiwi would be better off under American control. Travel writing was an important form of imperialist political propaganda that could create and disseminate narratives to a broad reading public. These writings were understood as "factual" accounts that informed peoples about foreign places, peoples, and cultures. Before the invention of radio, television, or the internet, literature such as travel writing was a primary source of information.

Travel in the 19th and early 20th century was much different than the type of mass travel industry that occurs in contemporary Hawai'i. According to the most recently published annual report from the Hawai'i Tourism Authority, around 8.3 million visitors came to Hawai'i in 2014.[9] In contrast, only about 500-700 tourists arrived per year during the early 19th century.[10] There are three primary reasons for this drastic difference: sugar, infrastructure and technology, and Hawai'i's relationship to America. Sugar production reigned in Hawai'i from the late 19th

[8] Jacobson, 97.
[9] Hawai'i Tourism Authority, *2014 Annual Visitor Research Report*, (Hawai'i Tourism Authority, 2014), 2.
[10] Ralph Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom, vol. 3, 1874-1893, The Kalakaua Dynasty*, (Honolulu: University of Hawa'i Press, 1967), 110.

century through the early to mid 20th century. During this same span, both infrastructure and technology grew rapidly, not only in Hawai‘i, but also in the rest of the world. The introduction of airplanes, automobiles, and larger passenger steamships along with the creation of airports, new ocean routes (such as the Panama Canal), and major roadways, allowed more people to travel.[11]

As the price of travel decreased, travel became more accessible to the growing American middle class rather than continuing to be an exclusively upper class privilege. Hawai‘i became increasingly entangled with America because of World War II and the transition from Territory to State in 1959. The end of World War II was a major catalyst for mass tourism in Hawai‘i.[12] During the war, tourism had declined but in the post-war, people started returning to the Pacific. For example, soldiers who had fought or had been stationed on Pacific Islands returned after the war to visit battlegrounds and memorials, such as Pearl Harbor. Statehood meant that Hawai‘i was officially "American". The combination of these factors created a perfect storm, one which allowed the "Imagined Hawai‘i" to quickly replace sugar as Hawai‘i's prized export.

Like many other areas of research in the field of Hawaiian history, travel writing and the travel industry are areas that are under-researched. Much of the scholarship produced about travel in Hawai‘i is focused on the contemporary mass tourism industry, from the 20th to 21st century. Also important to note is that the bulk of scholarship criticizing tourism began post-1990s. This growth in scholarship in the 1990s was a product of a specific context. The 1960s and 1970s brought about the period most commonly referred to as the "Hawaiian Renaissance".[13] The "Renaissance" emphasized the revitalization and strengthening of the Native Hawaiian community in areas such as language, land stewardship, voyaging, leadership, and scholarship. This period also sparked debates and questions over U.S. militarization, commercial development, and natural resource management. By the 1990s, there was an aggressive push for

[11] For more on the correlation of creating roads and the growth of tourism, see: Dawn. E. Duensing, *Hawai‘i's Scenic Roads: Paving the Way for Tourism in the Islands*, (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2015).
[12] James Mak, *Creating "Paradise of the Pacific": How Tourism Began in Hawaii*, (Honolulu: The Economic Research Organization at the University of Hawai‘i, 2015), 4. Mak stated that "Tourism would resume in a new era after the war when land-based airplanes begin to replace steamships in trans-Pacific travel to Hawai‘i."
[13] The coining of the term "Hawaiian Renaissance" is often attributed to Native Hawaiian scholar George S. Kanahele, who wrote the essay "The Hawaiian Renaissance", May 1979. Kanahele stated, " Like a dormant volcano coming to life again, the Hawaiians are erupting with all the pent-up energy and frustrations of people on the make. This great happening has been called a 'psychological renewal,' a 'reaffirmation,' a 'revival' or 'resurgence' and a 'renaissance.' No matter what you call it, it is the most significant chapter in 20th century Hawaiian history."

Native Hawaiian sovereignty in Hawai‘i.[14] With a new generation of both Kanaka and non-Kanaka students and teachers, scholarship shifted towards addressing and deconstructing colonial narratives. As a target of criticism, Hawai‘i’s tourism industry has been cited for exploiting Hawaiian culture, lands, and peoples.

My research has been informed by two groups of sources; scholarship specifically about Hawai‘i and scholarship with regional or cultural focuses beyond Hawai‘i. Each source pool is equally rich and important. The Hawai‘i pool is more direct to my research, however, as I have stated in the previous paragraph, the quantity of sources is insufficient. The “outside” pool has both depth and breadth in quality and quantity. Reading and understanding these sources have challenged me in understanding some of the broader concepts and contexts of travel, travel writing, empire and imperialism, and colonial narratives. Merging these two pools has provided me with an ocean of knowledge to navigate.

Cristina Bacchilega’s *Legendary Hawai‘i and the Politics of Place: Tradition, Translation, and Tourism* (2007) was my first introduction to Hawai‘i’s early travel industry. Bacchilega wrote that through tradition, translation, and tourism, the concept of “legendary Hawai‘i” was born. According to Bacchilega, legendary Hawai‘i is a “space constructed for non-Hawaiians to experience, via Hawaiian legends, a Hawai‘i that is exotic and primitive while beautiful and welcoming.”[15] Bacchilega argued that the translation of Hawaiian mo‘olelo (into English) during the late 19th and early 20th century shaped legendary Hawai‘i for the benefit of tourism and development.[16] By repackaging mo‘olelo and even creating faux-mo‘olelo, Euro-American writers were able to exoticize Hawai‘i as a travel destination.

In contrast to the Euro-American writers, Bacchilega profiled Emma Nākuina, who was commissioned by the Hawai‘i Promotion Committee to write a tourist guidebook in 1904, titled *Hawaii: Its People, Their Legends*.[17] Nākuina is an individual who could not be left out of this research because she was the first Kanaka to write a guidebook, and her writing was a voice of

[14] On November 19, 1993, President Bill Clinton signed a resolution of apology to the Hawaiian Kingdom and Native Hawaiians for the events surrounding the January 1893 overthrow, which had taken place 100 years prior. The resolution acknowledged the United States’ illegal role in supporting the group of Euro-American elite (known as the Committee of Safety) who were responsible for removing Queen Lili‘uokalani from power. This resolution is significant to Hawaiian sovereignty supporters because it is a formal record of the wrongdoing of the United States.
[15] Bacchilega, 5.
[16] Bacchilega, 61.
[17] The Hawaii Promotion Committee (HPC) was established in 1902 by the Territorial Government of Hawai‘i. It was one of the predecessors of current Hawai‘i Visitors and Convention Bureau (HVCB).

opposition to mainstream travel writing and American imperialism. In *Hawaii: Its People, Their Legends*, Nākuina offered an alternative way of promoting Hawai‘i. Additionally, Nākuina's life story is rich and complex, and her impact on Hawaiian History (the discipline) and the history of Hawai‘i is unknown to most.[18]

Houston Wood's *Displacing Natives: The Rhetorical Production of Hawai‘i* (1999) is another key text in the study of tourism, travel, and the imagined Hawai‘i. In the second section of his book, "Displacing Three Hawaiian Places", Wood wrote about how tourism had affected Hawai‘i Volcanoes National Park, Waikīkī, and "Hollywood's Hawai‘i". Wood reviewed the writings of missionaries and travelers (such as Isabella Bird) to show how white foreigners viewed Kīlauea and Pele. He argued that these writings, along with the establishment of Kīlauea as part of the National Park system, changed the way Pele has been received by foreign audiences. For some Native Hawaiians, Pele has remained as a real and celebrated ancestor; in the tourist industry, she has become commoditized, mythologized, and decontextualized. Wood also tracked how Waikīkī became "*the* Waikīkī": the tourists' playground (a Hawaiian place without Hawaiians). Travel writings, other promotional material, and novels constructed this imagined vision of Waikīkī. Wood explored portrayals of Hawai‘i and Hawaiians on the big screen, where themes such as sexuality, race, and exoticism were rampant. Wood's research is important not only because he criticized tourism and travel writing, but also because he used place as his lens of analysis.

Christine Skwiot's *The Purposes of Paradise: U.S. Tourism and Empire in Cuba and Hawai‘i* (2012) is particularly valuable because Skwiot placed tourism in the larger context of U.S. imperialism. Although Skwiot used travel writings as sources, she mainly focused on the industry as a whole. Her work is incredibly helpful in understanding the influential individuals and organizations that drove the tourism industry of Hawai‘i from the late 19th century and to the 1950s. Similar to Swiot's work, Amy Kaplan's *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture* (2005) is focused on U.S. imperialism and empire. Kaplan explained that her phrase "anarchy of empire" is an oxymoron; empire exudes stability and control, while anarchy is disorder and chaos. U.S. imperialism can be viewed "as a network of power relations that

[18] Although Bacchilega provided a biography of Nākuina, her main priority was discussing Nākuina's *Hawaii: Its People, Their Legends.* Jaime Uluwehi Hopkin's thesis *Hānau Ma Ka Lolo, For the Benefit of Her Race: a portrait of Emma Ka‘ilikapuolono Metcalf Beckley Nākuina* (2012) focused on Nākuina's life and her role in society. This supplies a more extensive view of Nākauina's life, family, and career.

changes over space and time and is riddled with instability, ambiguity, and disorder, rather than as a monolithic system of domination that the very word 'empire' implies."[19] The American Empire might not be as stable as thought to be. Kaplan has an brilliant deconstruction of Mark Twain and the "authority" of his travel writing about Hawai'i in the chapter "The Imperial Routes of Mark Twain". Twain wrote *Letters from Hawaii* in the 1860s; with Kaplan's analysis, I was able to track how the same narratives continued to exist and develop throughout the rest of the 19th century.

The use of travel writing as political propaganda is a major part of this thesis. Travel writing was used as way to re-write Hawaiian political history as it was happening. David J. Baker's "*Ea* and Knowing in Hawai'i" (1997) and Noenoe Silva's *Aloha Betrayed* (2004) were extremely helpful in thinking about the intersection of travel, politics, and history. Baker tracked how knowledge about Hawai'i (sovereignty, culture, identity) is produced, ignored, and asserted in the contemporary travel industry; between Kānaka 'Ōiwi and tourists, the industry, and the government. Tourists arrive with an acute vision of Hawai'i because they have only been exposed to Hawai'i through the lens of tourism promotion and mass media. Baker said that this "ignorance of Hawaiian history empowers tourists, and there is a noticeably willed quality to the indifference they can usually manage to achieve."[20] Issues such as Native Hawaiian sovereignty, health, houselessness, incarceration, etc. have rarely recieved attention in mainstream American media coverage. Renewed claims for sovereignty have unsettled the imagined view of Hawai'i as the "Aloha State" or Kānaka as passive "hosts".[21] Any type of public resistance, demonstration, or assertion by Kānaka 'Ōiwi indiviuals or organizations are criticized because these actions do not conform to the "happy natives" stereotype perpetuated by the tourism industry.

Noenoe Silva's *Aloha Betrayed* (2004) is a discussion of Kānaka 'Ōiwi political and cultural resistance during the 1880s and 1890s. Silva argued that, contrary to popular belief, Native Hawaiians were not passive against colonialism during the late 19th century. She uncovered the ways in which Kānaka resisted U.S. imperialism both subtly and blantantly. Historical myths and colonial narratives fall directly in the realm of issues discussed in David

[19] Amy Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002), 13-14.
[20] David J. Baker, "Ea and Knowing in Hawai'i," *Critical Inquiry* 23, no. 3 (1997), 645. The nickname "Aloha State" portrays Hawai'i as a happy place of racial harmony; while the portrayal of Native Hawaiians as "host", places them in a subservient position to foreigners.
[21] Baker, 649-650.

Baker's article. Once again, the success of Hawai'i's travel industry depends on creating the allure that the "Imagined Hawai'i" comes with no (historical) strings attached. Without stories of resistance, or evidence of anarchy, the effects of colonialism and imperialism are muted. Left in its place is the mythic story of a native people willing to be civilized and saved by America.

Besides scholarship focused specifically on Hawai'i, there are numerous texts that have greatly shaped my research and framework. Mary Louise Pratt's *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (1992) is recognized as a cornerstone text in the discourse of travel and travel writing. Pratt identified different colonial themes in travel writings produced throughout the 18th and 19th century. *Imperial Eyes* is associated with two important terms in travel writing discourse, "contact zones" and "anti-conquest".[22] The contact zone is the space of encounter and transculturation between traveler and resident. Pratt defined anti-conquest as "the strategies of representation whereby European bourgeois subjects seek to secure their innocence in the same moment as they assert European hegemony."[23] Pratt's idea of anti-conquest is at the foundation of RDK Herman's "The Aloha State: Place Names and the Anti-conquest of Hawai'i" (1999). Herman stated that anti-conquest "involves glorifying the Other at the same time that the Other is denied real power".[24] In this case, anti-conquest is a colonial contradiction. Herman applied anti-conquest to Hawaiian place names and language in the context of contemporary tourism.[25]

Matthew Frye Jacobson's *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad 1876-1917* (2000) covers historical U.S. relations (economic, political, social) with foreign populations, which included immigrants in the United States.

---

[22] Another related term is "imperialist nostalgia". Scholar Adria Imada described imperialist nostalgia as "the mourning of colonizers for what they have transformed. This nostalgia discursively erased the complicity of those who contributed to that change." Like anti-conquest, the colonizer is absolved from his or her own colonial behavior. Adria L. Imada, *Aloha America: Hula Circuits Through the U.S. Empire,* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2012), 158.

[23] Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, (New York: Routledge Press, 1992), 7.

[24] RDK Herman, "The Aloha State: Place Names and the Anti-Conquest of Hawai'i," *Annals Association of American Geographers* 89, no. 1 (1999), 77.

[25] For example, in tourism, 'ōlelo Hawai'i does not serve as means of actual communication. Tourists interact with Hawaiian words primarily through place names and music. The tourist cannot understand the meanings of names or lyrics but they understand the language as being different and "exotic". Outside of tourism, 'ōlelo Hawai'i has struggled to find its place in public or governmental spaces. Herman commented that "any move to assert the Hawaiian language as meaningful…is political, and threatening", Herman, 94. Scholar of Māori history and oratory Poia Rewi used the term "cultural tokenism" to define instances such as this. Rewi said that *whaikōrero*, a specific form of Māori oratory, is used for entertainment purposes rather than an actual serious cultural exchange. Whaikōrero might be used to open a larger forum or convention, in which the attendees have zero interest in Māori culture; they only see whaikōrero as entertainment devoid of actual meaning. Poia Rewi, *Whaikōrero: The World of Maori Oratory*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2010).

Jacobson focused on the period from 1876 to 1917, because "the dynamics of industrialization rapidly accelerated the rate at which Americans were coming into contact with foreign peoples, both inside and outside U.S. borders."[26] The title of the book references Theodore Roosevelt's 1899 criticism of Americans for becoming soft and too civilized. Roosevelt remarked that Americans needed to retain their "barbarian virtues" in order to maintain and extend power over other peoples.[27] These peoples were the non-white and indigenous populations of places such as Cuba, Puerto Rico, Hawai'i, and the Philippines. Jacobson situated these American-foreign encounters in labor, imagery, and politics. I was particularly drawn to his section on imagery because Jacobson demonstrated how the general American public came to be informed about foreign people through different forms of media such as art, advertisements, literature, and academia (science and anthropology). It did not matter if the producers of imagery actually went to these places or interacted with these peoples because these producers either claimed to be authoritative or were assumed to be authoritative.

Teresia Teaiwa's "Bikinis and Other S/Pacific N/Oceans" (1994) is one of the most notable essays in the field of Pacific Island Studies. This article is comparable to the works of David Baker, Noenoe Silva, and RDK Herman in its attention towards the subversion of indigenous history by colonial violence. Teaiwa framed her article by skillfully weaving together themes such as tourism, militarism, imperialism, gender, religion, and decolonization. She criticized the colonization of Bikini Atoll by U.S. military nuclear testing and then colonization of indigenous Pacific female bodies (bikinis). Teaiwa asked, "What does the word *bikini* evoke for you? A woman in a two-piece bathing suit, or a site for nuclear-weapons testing? A bikini-clad woman invigorated by solar radiation, or Bikini Islanders cancer-ridden from nuclear radiation?" She then argued, "By drawing attention to a sexualized and supposedly depoliticized female body, the bikini distracts from the colonial and highly political origins of its name."[28] This juxtaposition of Bikini and bikinis is yet another manifestation of anti-conquest; Americans can remain ignorant towards Bikini but simultaneously be consumers of bikinis.[29] This is

[26] Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917*, (New York: Hill and Wang, 2000), 4.
[27] Jacobson, 3-4.
[28] Teresia K. Teaiwa, "Bikinis and Other S/Pacific N/Oceans," *The Contemporary Pacific, Volume 6, Number 1, Spring 1994*, Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i Press, (1994), 87.
[29] Teaiwa explained "The appropriation of the name Bikini, a s/pacific site of trauma and dispossession, for a sexy generic bathing suit functions as fetishism", Teaiwa, 94. This idea of fetishism is similar to Herman's discussion of the place of Hawaiian language in tourism.

because the "mass-produced-and-marketed bikini simultaneously transcribes and erases the dispossession of the Bikini Islanders onto millions of female bodies."[30]

It is important to draw comparisons to other indigenous peoples who have been affected by tourism, especially in Oceania. Teaiwa's phrase "s/pacific n/oceans" (specific notions) is an acknowledgement that every culture and geographic space has its own specificities, but they also share generalities that Pacific peoples can address as a whole (such as militarism and tourism). Tourism serves imperialism because it actively seeks to dilute the perception of any type of colonial friction or violence towards indigenous peoples. As in the metaphor of the kōlea who can consume freely and leave, for a fleeting moment tourists can "play native" without enduring any of the colonial trauma that indigenous populations have experienced for generations.[31] In travel writings, this allowed travelers to assert their authority because they had "experienced" nativeness. Perhaps scholar and Black revolutionary Frantz Fanon would consider this to be a case of "White Skin, Black Masks".[32]

The primary argument in this thesis is driven by the close reading of a specific collection of travel writings. This selection of travel writing comes from two different periods: 1873-1879, and the span between 1892-1907. The travel writings from the 1870s include: *Paradise in the Pacific; A Book of Travel, Adventure, and Facts in the Sandwich Islands* by William Root Bliss (1873), Henry M. Whitney's *The Hawaiian Guide Book* (1875), Isabella Bird's *The Hawaiian Archipelago* (1875/1876), and lastly, *Notes by a Naturalist on the Challenger 1872-1876* by Henry Nottidge "H. N." Moseley (1879). I chose to discuss these texts because they are clustered within a relatively short span of years (1873-1879). They also present a diversity of writers from different backgrounds. In *Paradise in the Pacific*, William Root Bliss centered his attention on the Hawaiian government and monarchy. The world famous British explorer Isabella Bird captured her six month trip to Hawai'i through a series of letters published as *The Hawaiian*

[30] Teaiwa, 95.
[31] In the context of bikinis and tourism, "the bikini offered white bodies the opportunity to become tanned, colored, or otherwise marked as exotic", Teaiwa, 93. Similar to the kōlea whose feathers change before leaving.
[32] Fanon (1925-1961), native of Martinique, was a psychiatrist, philosopher, and highly influential scholar in the Black revolutionary and Black consciousness movements during the mid 20th century. His most well known work is *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961). Fanon's 1952 book, *Black Skin, White Masks*, is a psychological study aimed at understanding how racism and colonization affects the psyche of Black peoples. In short, Fanon argued that colonized Black peoples seek to emulate the colonizer ("white masks") because they have been programmed to think of themselves ("black skin") as inferior. See: Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, New York: Grove Press, 1967. My own reversal of the verbiage, "White Skin, Black Masks", reflects the traveler's ability to emulate the Other ("black masks"), while maintaining a colonial identity ("white skin").

Archipelago. Whitney's *Guide Book* is important because of its position as the first official guide book of Hawai‘i. Lastly, H. N. Moseley, was a member of the renowned Challenger Expedition for the British Crown.

The second grouping of travel writing consists of Charles Warren Stoddard's *A Trip to Hawaii* (1892, 1897, 1901 editions), Stoddard's *Hawaiian Life: Being Lazy, Letters From Low Altitude* (1894), John L. Stevens and William B. Oleson's *Picturesque Hawaii: A Charming Description of Her Unique History, Strange People, Exquisite Climate, Wondrous Volcanoes, Luxurious Productions, Beautiful Cities, Corrupt Monarchy, Recent Revolution and Provisional Government* (1894), *The Tourists' Guide Through the Hawaiian Islands, Descriptive of Their Scenes and Scenery* by Henry M. Whitney (1895), *Hawaii: Its People Their Legends* by Emma Nākuina (1904), and *Frances Stuart Parker: Reminiscences and Letters* by Frances Stuart Parker (1907).

Once again, these texts were produced by a diversity of writers. Charles Warren Stoddard was a prolific American author and writer during the late 19th and early 20th century. *The Tourists' Guide* is Henry M. Whitney's second attempt at writing a guidebook. The writers of *Picturesque Hawaii* and *Riches and Marvels of Hawaii*, John L. Stevens and William B. Oleson were prominent figures in Hawai‘i. Stevens was the ex-U.S. Minister to the Hawaiian Kingdom and key agent in the 1893 overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom. Oleson was the first principal (1887-1893) of the Kamehameha Schools and was openly anti-monarchy and pro-annexation. Their publication functions not only as a guidebook but also as justification for the political changes. Frances Stuart Parker was a famous American teacher who was invited to teach summer school in Hawai‘i in 1898. After she died, her memoirs, in the form of letters, were published in 1907.

There are two styles of travel writing: travelogues (or personal accounts) and guidebooks. Travelogues were written by individuals traveling to or through Hawai‘i. Before leisure travel to Hawai‘i, travelogues existed in the form of journals and notes by explorers, traders and merchants, and also as the diaries, official reports, and letters of the ABCFM missionaries. Perhaps one of the most studied travelogues are Mark Twain's letters, written during his stay in Hawai‘i in 1866. For this reason, I did not do my own analysis of Mark Twain's letters. Instead I rely on Amy Kaplan's interpretation of Twain's writing in *Anarchy of Empire.* The central difference between travelogues and guidebooks is that travelogue writers placed themselves

within the text in a first-person narrative. These writers had personal interactions and encounters with Kānaka ʻŌiwi and other citizens of the Hawaiian Kingdom. The reading audience experienced Hawaiʻi through the writers' senses, thoughts, and conversations. The travelogue writers in this selection are Bliss, Bird, Moseley, Stoddard (*Hawaiian Life*), and Parker.

Travel guidebooks were usually published by independent authors or editors, in some cases they were supported by organizations or businesses. These authors or editors were residents of Hawaiʻi. Many guide books were one-time editions but others such as the Thomas G. Thrum's *Hawaiian Almanac and Annual*, as well as the *Paradise of the Pacific* magazine were published monthly or annually over an extended period.[33] As previously stated, Henry M. Whitney's *The Hawaiian Guide Book* was the first guide book published for Hawaiʻi. Travel guides were usually written from the third-person perspective. The narrator would take the reader on a literary journey through different areas and "landmarks" of Hawaiʻi, such as the open market in Honolulu, Nuʻuanu Pali, Kīlauea, etc. Many times the writers or editors also utilized interpretations of Hawaiian history and culture, which almost always included a mention of the moʻolelo of Kamehameha or Pele. Guide books were sources of practical information for travelers: climate, shipping prices and timetables, lists of churches, lists of schools, lists of government officials, etc.

Primary sources relating to the travel writing of Hawaiʻi are vast. Guidebooks and personal accounts from the 19th and early 20th century are publicly available and easily accessible in both electronic databases and physical collections. One of the most important collections is the online database—https://archive.org, which hosts a plethora of historical documents, including most of the travel writings presented in this thesis. Various types of travel writings in both physical (including originals) and digitized forms can be found at the Hamilton Library at University of Hawaiʻi Mānoa and the Moʻokini Library at University of Hawaiʻi Hilo, as well as at the Hawaiʻi State Archives and Hawaiian Historical Society.

[33] More commonly known as *Thrum's Annual*. *Thrum's Annual* ran from 1875 until 1936, a couple of years after Thrum's passing. In the mid 20th century, *Paradise of the Pacific* became *Honolulu Magazine*, a publication currently still in circulation. Unlike Thrum's *Annual*, the *Paradise of the Pacific* was not an independent production. It featured contributions from a variety of writers and editors. Coupled with its status as the official guide book of the Kingdom of Hawaiʻi, and the later Territory of Hawaiʻi, the *Paradise of the Pacific* benefitted from a more stable foundation. The most valuable and comprehensive research on the *Paradise of the Pacific* is Paulette C. Feeney's 2009 dissertation *Aloha and Allegiance: Imagining America's Paradise.* Feeney was critical of *Paradise of the Pacific*'s role in creating the imagined Hawaiʻi, from its inception until statehood.

In addition to the amount of readily available travel writings, nūpepa/newspapers (ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, English language, domestic, foreign) are critical primary sources in this thesis.[34] Three online databases were crucial in finding newspaper sources: Chronicling America (English language), Papakilo Database (ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi), and Ulukau (ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi). Newspaper articles and obituaries provide biographical information about travel writers who do not have officially published biographies. In certain cases, I was able to find newspaper articles about travel writers while they were actually traveling, such as Frances Stuart Parker's 1898 trip. Newspapers are valuable repositories for political and social commentary, which is extremely useful in the discussion of travel writing in the 1890s.

The writings of royalist (pro-monarchy) citizens are found within the Hawaiian language nūpepa, especially in resistance publications such as *Ke Aloha Aina*. With the work of Noenoe Silva and other scholars, it is now commonly understood that Kānaka ʻŌiwi actively resisted the 1893 overthrow and multiple attempts of annexation; but it is also important to keep uncovering writings in the archive that are waiting to be illuminated. These writings are about loyalty for country and monarchy, and of criticism towards political, social, cultural, and economical changes. These sources are a rebuttal to the tropes and narratives of European and Euro-American produced travel writing.

All research has limitations, and this thesis is no exception. One of the limitations is in regards to the oft-asked question: is it possible to track circulation and readership of the individual travel writings? The answer is both yes and no, mostly no. Some of the publications in this thesis include the number of printed copies on the actual text. I have also found copy amounts in newspaper articles. However, numbers are just numbers in this case. The number of copies printed does not answer the question as to how many were sold, or more importantly, how many people actually read the publication. Even so, there is no easy or clear way to quantify or qualify the audience's reception and interpretation of the different travel writings. For writers

[34] Here, "foreign" refers to American newspapers, while "domestic" refers to newspapers produced in the Hawaiian Kingdom. One very important thing to know about the Hawaiian nūpepa archive is that they are not just a repository of Native Hawaiian voices and Hawaiian knowledge. Nūpepa were published by Kānaka and Euro-American residents of Hawaiʻi. They were a place for news and knowledge both domestic and foreign. Also, just like English language newspapers, every nūpepa had its own position and agenda. For example, *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, one of the main longer running nūpepa, was anti-monarchy and pro-annexation. The nūpepa *Ke Aloha Aina* was established during the 1890s specifically as a royalist (pro-monarchy, anti-annexation) nūpepa. For more information on Hawaiian Language newspapers and the Hawaiian language archive see: Puakea M. Nogelmeier, *Mai Paʻa I Ka Leo*. Honolulu, Bishop Museum Press, 2010. Also Noelani Arista, "I ka moʻolelo nō ke ola: In History There Is Life," *Anglistica*, (2010).

such as Isabella Bird, H. N. Moseley, and Charles Warren Stoddard, who were already notable within their lifetimes, it can be inferred that their texts had a wider readership.

Throughout the following chapters, I draw out the common themes, tropes, and narratives found in travel writings. By unwinding these literary threads over a span of time and through diverse publications, I show that there is an amount of inter-textuality between travel writings in specific contexts. If the average American or European living in the mid-late 19th century read travelogues from Hawai‘i, they could expect to find major similarities between the texts. In this respect, trying to quantify readership becomes less important.

Another question is why did I choose to focus on the 1870s and 1890s, while skipping the 1880s? This was not the plan in the very early stages of my research. However, the sources dictated the direction of the thesis. I kept finding interesting travel writings, which happened to be grouped in the 1870s, while I actively looked for sources from 1890s, thus, I ended up with two non-consecutive decades.

Most importantly, this thesis is not an all-encompassing grand story about the foundations and beginnings of the early tourism industry of Hawai‘i. It is not a macroscopic discussion of tourism; instead it is fixated on travel writing and its immediate impact on tourism. I do not intentionally track any financial information, statistics about travelers, legislation in regards to tourism, or other forms of promotion (such as artwork or displays). Broader contexts and information are applied when necessary, but travel writers and their travel writings are at the nucleus of my research and this thesis.

As a whole, the purpose of my research is to critique the role and place of travel writing and tourism in Hawai‘i of both the past and the present. I build upon the historiographic foundation created by the works of Wood, Bacchilega, Skwiot, Baker and so many others in order to continue this much needed discussion of travel writing and tourism. In addition to building, I also aim at filling some of the puka (holes or gaps) in the foundation. This thesis encompasses a variety of travel writings and travelers into the conversation. Many of the travel writings have not been analyzed through close reading or even analyzed at all. I believe that close reading provides a deeper and fuller analysis, which allows the reader to get a more complete understanding of each individual text.

My research and analytical framework are informed by my training in Hawaiian History. Most of the scholars in the historiography are from fields outside of History, such as Art,

American Studies, Cultural/Ethnic Studies, Geography, Political Science, and English. An integral facet of my training includes understanding Hawaiian epistemology and culture. This allows me certain insights in the unpacking of travel writing that the untrained eye may not initially recognize.

Another key is the ability to navigate the underutilized Hawaiian language "archive". The archive is not consolidated in a single location or repository, instead, the archive consists of nūpepa, manuscripts, books, essays, letters, etc. Historian Noelani Arista noted that Hawai'i has "the largest literature base of any native language in the Pacific, perhaps all of native North America, exceeding 1,000,000 pages of printed text, 125,000 of which were Hawaiian-language newspapers."[35] However, Arista continued, "despite the huge amount of written and published Hawaiian-language material, the majority of histories produced about Hawai'i have been written as if these soruces do not exist."[36] As the discipline moves forward, hopefully the use of Hawaiian language sources will be considered normal instead of groundbreaking.[37]

Chapter Outline

Chapter One, "Modes and Motives: A History of Movement", is grounded in the historiography of travel writing theory and discourse. I outline the general history and evolution of European (British) and American travel until the end of the 19th century, as well as the purposes of travel, from "discovery" explorations to scientific expeditions to leisure travel. If travel evolved through the centuries this means that travel writing also changed through time as well. By the mid to late 19th century, travel writing was one of the most popular literary forms in the America and Europe. This travel writing culture influenced the "perceived authority" of travel writers. I also identify the general themes in travel writing: race and culture, land, gender, death and disease. These four themes characterized interactions between European and Euro-American travel writers and foreign/indigenous peoples and lands. The second half of the chapter follows the evolution of British and American travel writing into the beginnings of the travel

[35] Noelani Arista, "I ka mo'olelo nō ke ola: In History There Is Life," *Anglistica*, (2010), 16.
[36] Arista, "I ka mo'olelo nō ke ola: In History There Is Life", 16-17.
[37] Scholars that I have mentioned so far, such as Noelani Arista, Cristina Bacchilega, Puakea Nogelmeier, Noenoe Silva all utilize the Hawaiian language archive. In "I ka mo'olelo nō ke ola", Noelani Arista listed a number of scholars who have worked and continue to work with the archive. These scholars are spread across disciplines such as History, Hawaiian Language, Hawaiian Studies, Literature, Political Science, Environmental Studies, Music, Anthropology, Geography, and Law.

writing produced about Hawai‘i. I also identify the general narrative themes in an overview of mid-late 19th century Hawai‘i travel writing.

In Chapter Two, “Producing Paradise: the ‘Imagined Hawai‘i’ in the 1870s”, I argue that European and Euro-American travel writers sought to assert their percieved “authority” in an unfamiliar space by deploying colonial narratives and tropes over Hawaiian lands and bodies, however, their perceived authority was constantly challenged and destabilized by the realities they faced. This authority was based on the culture of 19th century travel writing, as well as their own ethno-centricity. By challenging the authority of travel writers, the label of “foreign” is re-focused on the traveler instead of Hawai‘i and Kānaka ‘Ōiwi. The texts and writers presented in this chapter are: *Paradise in the Pacific; A Book of Travel, Adventure, and Facts in the Sandwich Islands* by William Root Bliss (1873), Henry M. Whitney’s *The Hawaiian Guide Book* (1875), Isabella Bird’s *The Hawaiian Archipelago* (1875/1876), and lastly, *Notes by a Naturalist on the Challenger 1872-1876* by Henry Nottidge “H. N.” Moseley (1879).

In Chapter Three, “Pilikia in Paradise: the ‘Imagined Hawai‘i’ in the 1890s”, I contend that in the midst of political turmoil between 1893-1900, travel writers utilized colonial narratives and historical revisionism to explicitly support and rationalize American imperialism and Euro-American control of Hawai‘i. By supporting American annexation, travel writers could promote Hawai‘i as a stable and secure American-controlled paradise. The group of travel writings reviewed in this chapter are: Charles Warren Stoddard’s *A Trip to Hawaii* (1892, 1897, 1901 editions), Stoddard’s *Hawaiian Life: Being Lazy, Letters From Low Altitude* (1894), John L. Stevens and William B. Oleson’ *Picturesque Hawaii* (1894) and *Riches and Marvels of Hawaii* (1900), *The Tourists’ Guide Through the Hawaiian Islands, Descriptive of Their Scenes and Scenery* by Henry M. Whitney (1895), and *Frances Stuart Parker: Reminiscences and Letters* by Frances Stuart Parker (1907). The chapter ends with Emma Nākuina and her guidebook *Hawaii: Its People, Their Legends* (1904). As previously mentioned, Nākuina was the first Kanaka ‘Ōiwi to write a guidebook for travelers. I show how *Hawaii: Its People, Their Legends* was very different in comparison to the other travel writers. Nākuina’s text was her response to the European and American norm of travel writings, and a critique of American imperialism. She used her travel writing to celebrate her home Hawai‘i, her people, and their mo‘olelo.

In Chapter Four, "Hele Aku, Hoʻi Mai: Re-visiting Moʻolelo Huakaʻi", I step back from travel writings produced by foreigners and I re-trace moʻolelo huakaʻi (stories of travel) of Kānaka ʻŌiwi. These travel accounts are an important and but overlooked space of scholarship because travel writing theory and discourse is almost exclusively centered on Western travel and travel writers. In this chapter, I re-visit moʻolelo that include the likes of cross-voyaging chiefs, adventurous akua, diplomatic envoys, and politcally savvy aliʻi. These accounts are critical to the understanding of how Kānaka interacted with the new peoples and places they came across, as well how these experiences shaped their view of themselves and their homeland.

The use of the phrase "travel writing" is problematic in the context of this chapter because the discourse privileges writing while ignoring oral tradition. The word "moʻolelo" is a contraction of the term moʻo ʻōlelo; moʻo meaning a succession or series and ʻōlelo meaning language or speech. Thus, moʻolelo are literally a succession of speech, which reflects Hawaiian oral tradition. Knowledge such as stories, mele, oli, genealogies, place names, farming and fishing techniques, etc. were passed from mouth to mouth.

Over time, the definition of moʻolelo has become more ambiguous, especially after the increased interactions with European and American foreigners, and the introduction of palapala (writing). Now moʻolelo can refer to a story, myth, history, legend, literature, journal, essay, chronicle, record, or article. This is especially critical in the context of the 19th century, as Native Hawaiians became one of the most literate peoples in the world. As Hawaiian language scholar Puakea Nogelmeier noted:

> Many of the forms and processes of communication documented in Hawaiian oral tradition by early observers, such as oratory, recitation, chant and protocols, were continued for generation after literacy became widespread. Evidence of this retention is incorporated into the letters and articles for the newspapers, especially in the latter half of the 19th century.[38]

Moʻolelo such as Pele or Pāʻao, which clearly originated pre-Cook (1778), were published in newspapers. Although text became the new vessel for carrying the moʻolelo, the moʻolelo themselves maintained their connection to orality. Even compositions such as editorial columns and letters published in newspapers contained evidence of the

[38] Puakea M. Nogelmeier, *Mai Paʻa I Ka Leo: Historical Voice in Hawaiian Primary Materials, Looking Forward and Listening Back*, (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 2010), 91.

syncretism between orality and literacy. "Poetic forms of address" such as welina (salutations) were used to address the reading audience.[39] Newspapers were a way of disseminating oral traditions to a lot of people all at one time. Nogelmeier also explained that newspapers constituted an oral experience for Native Hawaiians in the 19th century. A Native Hawaiian household might have had only one newspaper to share amongst themselves, so the news articles and stories were read aloud for the entire family to hear.[40]

Therefore, I use the phrase moʻolelo huakaʻi to be inclusive of all moʻolelo that pertain to travel. To draw a hard line between or to rigidly categorize what is "authentic oral tradition" versus what is "purely literary" is irresponsible, as well as problematic because of syncretism. The broader goal of Chapter 4 is to start a discussion and perhaps illustrate the metaphorical "star trail" for further research on Kānaka ʻŌiwi travel and moʻolelo huakaʻi.

In the epilogue, "Ka Hoʻi (The Return)", I summarize and highlight my findings throughout this thesis. I also bridge these findings with a brief historiography of contemporary research, in the effort to show how historical narratives are perpetuated in today's tourism industry. These surviving narratives are critical to the way people continue to envision Hawaiʻi and Kānaka ʻŌiwi.

Navigating the Past, Discovering the Future

History is often figuratively described as a dialogue between the past and present (and the future as well). What historians produce is an interpretation of this conversation. Sometimes the dialogue is clear and crisp, while other times it is muffled and distorted. The past never changes, but history is fluid, continously changing as new sources, methodologies, and interpretations come into existence. One of the most noted ʻōlelo noʻeau about the conceptualization of Hawaiian history is "I ka wā ma mua, ka wā ma hope", there in the past, lies the future. Historian Lilikalā Kameʻeleihiwa beautifully interprets this concept:

[39] Nogelmeier, 92.
[40] Nogelmeier, 81. Nogelmeier noted that the newspaper publishers were not happy with the sharing of newspapers by Kānaka because it undercut their profits.

> It is if the Hawaiian stands firmly in the present, with his back to the future, and his eyes fixed upon the past, seeking historical answers for present-day dilemmas. Such an orientation is to the Hawaiian an eminently practical one, for the future is always unknown, whereas the past is rich in glory and knowledge. It also bestows a natural propensity for the study of history.[41]

Simply, we look to the past which informs our present, and to some extent, our future. Because history is fluid, its implications for the present and future change as well.

With no serious economic alternative in sight, Hawai‘i continues to rely on mass tourism and its main export called “paradise”. As Hawai‘i also struggles with problems such as rising housing prices and property taxes, environmental issues, and overdevelopment, the implications of Hawaiian history have increasingly greater stakes. Recently (April 2016), the Hawai‘i Tourism Authority[42] initiated a campaign urging citizens of Hawai‘i to be more welcoming towards tourists and to support tourism, invoking the slogan “Tourism is a Family Business”.[43] This sparked a backlash, most visible on social media platforms. Both Kānaka and non-Kānaka continue to feel the burden of the industry, yet are told they that they have no choice but to support it. As the differences between the “Imagined Hawai‘i” and the realities of Hawai‘i faced by its people continues to create friction, soon the question will be asked, “How did Hawai‘i get to this point?” Well, perhaps the answers lie in the past.

[41] Lilikalā Kame‘eleihiwa, *Native Land and Foreign Desires: Pehea Lā E Pono Ai?* Honolulu: (Bishop Museum Press, 1992), 22-23.
[42] The HTA is under the State of Hawai‘i, while the HVCB is a non-profit.
[43] Audrey McAvoy, “Agency to Hawaii residents: Don’t hate on tourists,” *Associated Press*, April 25, 2016. The HTA created two video clips for their campaign, both are posted on the HTA Youtube account: “Tourism is a Family Business-Chef Mark “Gooch” Noguchi, Mission Social Hall and Cafe” and “Tourism is a Family Business – Renee Kimura, Kimura Lauhala Shop”.

-Ch. 1-
Modes and Motives: A History of Movement

Quests of different sorts have motivated travellers for millennia. They may be spiritual or material, pacific or martial, solitary or collective, outward into the world or inward into the self. Travellers strive for victory—over aspects of themselves or over others. They search for enlightenment; for knowledge of other people, societies and culture, of flora, fauna and geology; they look for financial profit for themselves, their companies or their countries; they seek new homes, temporary or long-term, through choice or necessity; they pursue leisure, sex, self-improvement; they aim to find spiritual reward or psychological repair in enactments of the inner journey.
–Tim Youngs, *The Cambridge Introduction to Travel Writing.*

Travellers' tales had wide coverage. Their dissemination occurred through the popular press, from the pulpit, in travel brochures which advertised for immigrants, and through oral discourse. They appealed to the voyeur, the soldier, the romantic, the missionary, the crusader, the adventurer, the entrepreneur, the imperial public servant and the Enlightenment scholar. They also appealed to the downtrodden, the poor and those whose lives held no possibilities in their own imperial societies, and who chose to migrate as settlers.
–Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies.*

Across deserts, grasslands, and tundra. Over hills and mountains, under the canopies of forests. Crossing streams, rivers, lakes and navigating oceans. By foot, animal, boat, car, plane. Guided by star lines in the sky. Following the squiggly lines on parchment. Migration, expedition, labor, exile, pilgrimage, diaspora, battle, diplomacy, and tourism. Humans have always been in motion, through space and time.

Accounts of human travel have been preserved through oral and literary tradition. Travel accounts serve many purposes, from preserving cosmologies and migration, to recording experiences of traveling merchants or pilgrims, or even the scientific and anthropological documentation of "Other" peoples and cultures, animals, and plants. Every culture has its own history of travel accounts, whether it is within domestic boundaries or travel to lands beyond. The 19th and early 20th century British and American travel accounts that I present in Chapters 2 and 3 belong to a long existing travel writing tradition. In the 19th century, the American style of travel writing was very similar to that of the British, especially because America was heavily influenced by the Victorian Era. In order to understand travel writing in the late 19th and early 20th century, one must trace the evolution of British (European) and American travel and travel writing.

In *The Cambridge Introduction to Travel Writing* by Tim Youngs and *English Travel Writing* by Barbara Korte, both Youngs and Korte stated that travel writing has been a relatively newer area of discourse. According to Youngs, over the past 30-40 years, travel writing has been taken more seriously by scholars, as it was earlier thought to be a second-rate form a literature,

unworthy of scholarship and discourse.[1] Korte added that travel writings are now "increasingly analysed for their projection of culture-specific mentalities, their representations of 'otherness' and imaging of foreign countries, or as phenomena of inter-culturality."[2] Travel is a discourse that is not bound to one or a just a few disciplines; it encompasses fields such as economics, natural sciences, politics, history, anthropology, and of course, literature.

The traveler or narrator shapes the experience in his/her own story; accounts can be religious or secular, joyous or gloomy. Youngs wrote, "Travel accounts or travelogues are defined by a narrative core; they always tell the story of a journey."[3] While Korte explained, "accounts of travel are *never* objective; they inevitably reveal the culture-specific and individual patterns of perception and knowledge which every traveller brings to the travelled world."[4] Travel accounts are records of human interactions and relationships with one another, with unfamiliar lands, languages, and cultures. Every interaction is formed by the traveler and by the world they travel through. The fluidity and flexibility of travel accounts creates difficulty in limiting accounts to one "standard" form.

The traveler's personal background and intent of travel dictates the experience and how the experience is recounted. For example, a traveler like American poet Charles Warren Stoddard produced a very different type of account than British explorer Isabella Bird. Korte argued that due to the variety of publications and quantity of travel writers, there is no true travel writing canon; instead the publications of famous men and women receive more attention than lesser known travelers.[5] However, she claimed the absence of a canon is not necessarily a problem, as "travel writing offers the reader literary ground which is previously untrodden and unmapped, and in which there is a lot to discover for oneself."[6] In a landscape of travel writing, the reader becomes the literary traveler.

In *English Travel Writing*, Korte raised the discussion of authenticity and travel accounts. How does a reader or scholar validate the "truth" of a particular account? Do travel accounts need to be validated? Korte contended, "The actual experience of a journey is reconstructed, and therefore fictionalized, in the moment of being told. This is even the case in the accounts in the

[1] Tim Youngs, *The Cambridge Introduction to Travel Writing*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 7.
[2] Barbara Korte, *English Travel Writing from Pilgrimages to Postcolonial Explorations*, translated by Catherine Matthias, (New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 2000), 2.
[3] Youngs, 9.
[4] Korte, 6. Italicization my own.
[5] Korte, 16.
[6] Korte, 17.

form of diaries and letters written during a journey, in which the interval between the experience and its telling is smaller than in retrospective travelogues."[7] Sometimes the traveler cannot capture their experience at the immediate instance in which it is taking place. The traveler might be hiking or on horseback for miles before pausing to jot down notes. The ephemeral thoughts, feelings, and observations of encounters may be lost, distorted, heightened, or undermined, both intentionally and unintentionally. Korte elaborated that the readers' search for the "authentic" reading experience is perhaps what makes travel writing attractive. Many casual readers, especially in older times, may have never had the opportunity to travel and re-trace the journeys that they had read about. The reader relied on "his or her *assumption* that the text is based on travel fact, on an authentic journey, and this assumption can only be tested beyond the text itself."[8] The more authentic the traveler's writing, the more authentic the reading experience; thus the reader figuratively takes on the identity of the traveler.

Korte's problematization of "authority" and "truth" in travel writings is important in the discussion of travel accounts created through oral traditions. Oral traditions and histories, especially from non-Western, indigenous cultures, have often been discounted and discredited as being erroneous, and too malleable. However, if oral traditions are so-called "untruthful", then equally so are travel writings. The scholar who analyzes any type of travel account should read against the grain. Even things that may prove to be unfounded give insight into the way the travel writer may have interpreted the experience or wanted to portray a certain perspective.

Both Youngs and Korte looked towards the broader world history of Europe, Africa, and Asia as the foundation of modern British (and American) travel writing. These three regions became increasingly connected to one another through exploration, conquest, trade, and religion. Some of the earliest forms of travel stories come from the ancient civilizations of the Fertile Crescent (Mesopotamia), such as the Sumerian account of Gilgamesh. Another example of travel accounts are found in the hieroglyphs inscribed on Egyptian tombs, which recorded explorations and mercantile operations.

Much later, Greeks and Romans developed their own accounts through writing and speech. Youngs and Korte agree that Greek and Roman travel accounts established the foundations for the Medieval and Early Modern ages. Korte said these "active travellers" created

[7] Korte, 11. "Retrospective travelogues" are accounts in which the traveler writes or does major editing post-journey.
[8] Korte, 10.

both geographical and travel texts. One of the most famous Greek travel stories is the *Odyssey* epic, in which the protagonist Odysseus must find his way home following the Trojan Wars.[9] During the Hellenistic Era, a new genre called *periegesis* was "specifically dedicated to travel, depicting countries, towns and sights in the form of an imaginary guided tour."[10] This era of travel writing provides an intriguing example of orality versus writing, and "truth". Korte wrote:

> Classical travel writing drew upon (pseudo-)scientific literature as well as on myths, anecdotes and life histories which were considered authoritative if only because they had been handed down the generations – even if their descriptions were not empirically attestable. What had been written in a text was understood to be true; empirical verification was of less significance in the claim to truth than it was to become in later periods.[11]

The fact that an account had been passed down through oral tradition, and eventually written down, validated the source in the eyes of the Greek and Roman audience. If the accounts had survived the generations, then they must have been "true" or believable. Korte explained that the textual authority of notable writers often went unquestioned; for example, the existence of "fabulous creatures" in far away lands.[12]

Pilgrimages to religious sites and holy lands (like Jerusalem or Mecca) were an important part of medieval travel. Accounts of pilgrimages were written by merchants, missionaries, and of course, pilgrims. These travel accounts included itineraries, routes and distances, and lists of various expenses. The writings also warned future pilgrims of possible dangers, such as "deceivers" who would try to swindle pilgrims. Unsurprisingly, pilgrimage accounts focused mostly on the description of the actual holy site or monument rather than on the author's own experiences while traveling.[13]

In the transition from the Medieval to Early Modern period, the collection of empirical data became increasingly common in travel writing as opposed to earlier times. As more people traveled and wrote about foreign places, a level of validation was established; thus accounts that had previously held textual authority were now questioned. Travelers began to de-bunk the existence of monsters and other imagined creatures. The Early Modern period (16th cent.) was

[9] Youngs, 20.
[10] Korte, 21.
[11] Korte, 22.
[12] Korte, 22. This belief lasted through the Middle Ages and the beginning part of the Early Modern period.
[13] Korte, 25-26.

marked by the new age of European explorers, merchants, and colonizers in the New World. Korte added that, "The material interest in the 'discovery', exploration and colonization of America causes the travellers to scrutinize this foreign world, to perceive it in all its empirical qualities – and to write home about it in meticulous detail."[14] A widely read text during this time was Richard Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations, Voyages and Discoveries of the English Nation* (1589). Hakluyt's writing was driven by "scientific interest and a desire to promote overseas expansion and the colonization of North America."[15] To supplement accounts of the New World, travelers also brought back artifacts and curiosities to Europe as tangible representations of the foreign. Artifacts and curiosities ranged from cultural objects to plants and animals, and even to indigenous peoples who were abducted from their homelands.[16]

The collection of empirical data paired with exploration and colonization formed "scientific travel". The late 17th century was regarded as the "age of New Science"; travel for the purpose of science and data collection became commonplace. Scientific travel lasted through the course of the 18th century and into the 19th century. Many of the prolific European explorers of this period were driven by science and the desire to collect knowledge for their respective nations. "Explorer-scientists" such as Louis Antoine de Bougainville (France), Alexander von Humboldt (Prussia), and James Cook (Britain) set out on expeditions with "precise instructions for observations in the realms of geography, astronomy, meteorology, botany, anthropology and so on."[17] Cartography was an extremely important aspect of these scientific explorations. For example, the European mapping of Oceania and the dividing of the Pacific as "Micronesia", "Melanesia", and "Polynesia" continues to have a major impact on how Oceania is viewed by insiders and outsiders alike. European cartography literally and figuratively put Oceania—on the map. The more knowledge collected, the more Western explorers frequently traveled to and colonized these places.

---

[14] Korte, 30-31.
[15] Korte, 31. Korte described Hakluyt as a "geographer with considerable political influence at the court of Queen Elizabeth I."
[16] Korte, 31.
[17] Korte, 37. In *Imperial Eyes*, Mary Louise Pratt covered von Humboldt's explorations in Latin America from 1799 to 1804. Pratt argued that in his numerous writings, specifically *Views of the Cordillera*, von Humboldt constructed Latin America as "primal nature". He believed that the savageness of nature (plants, animals, scenery, etc.) in Latin America influenced and inspired the indigenous artifacts he acquired. As Pratt stated, this so-called "harmony" between nature and indigenous resulted "from assimilating culture to nature in a way that guarantees the inferior status of indigenous America: the more savage the nature, the more savage the culture." Pratt, 132-133.

In *Imperial Eyes*, Mary Louis Pratt discussed the production of European scientific knowledge and exploration in the 18th century. She argued that two specific events changed how European elites understood themselves and their relation to the Earth: Swedish scientist Carl Linnaeus' publishing of *Systema Naturae* and Spain's La Condamine expedition (both in 1735). These two events expanded "planetary consciousness", which functioned as a cog of Euro-centrism.[18] In *Systema Naturae*, Linnaeus categorized and systemized the natural world; every organism had a place within the system or network. By the mid 18th century, other scholars had further ordered the natural world, creating hierarchies based on race. Europeans were considered to be the most refined, while African cultures were the least civilized. Indigenous Americans, Pacific Peoples, and "Asiatic" cultures ranged the middle of the hierarchy.[19] Through the systemization of the natural world, 18th century Europeans "asserted an urban, lettered, male authority over the whole of the planet."[20]

One of the most important types of British travel during the 17th through 19th centuries was the "Grand Tour". At its inception the Grand Tour was an experience primarily for young aristocratic British men to become educated and cultured abroad. In *English Travel Writing: from Pilgrimages to Postcolonial Explorations*, Barbara Korte described the Grand Tour as a "social institution" that was a part of these young men's formal education and personal growth. Those who embarked on the Tour left the British Isles and crossed over to "the Continent", to explore European countries, particularly France and Italy, but also Germany, Switzerland, and the Low Countries (European west coast).[21]

The era of the Grand Tour also coincided with the larger European Enlightenment. If the Tour was a method of reaching enlightenment, then those who did not travel felt uncultured or even inferior.[22] Grand Tourists visited museums, libraries, academies and other institutions in order to "polish the traveller's cosmopolitan manners and to shape his aesthetic taste" in architecture, interior design, art, and music.[23] Tourists also had "patriotic obligations"; for example, James Howell's 1642 guidebook *Instructions for Forraine Travell*. Howell suggested that tourists should gather knowledge that would be useful and beneficial to their own country.

[18] Pratt, 16.
[19] Pratt, 32. Of course, there are more complex hierarchies within each sub-section.
[20] Pratt, 38.
[21] Korte, 41.
[22] Korte, 41.
[23] Korte, 42.

Even King Henry VIII financed young scholars to live abroad for several years on the Continent to study "customs, laws, forms of government and modern languages, as well as to establish contacts."[24]

The Grand Tour also presented "temptations" such as inns and brothels, and "dangers" such as Roman Catholicism (as opposed to the Anglican Church) that could lead a young British man astray. Curiosity and "pure wanderlust" were distractions that could entice travelers to stray off of the beaten path.[25] Even the adoption or imitation of other European customs was problematic to British society. British travelers were expected to maintain and re-adopt their "British-ness" when they returned to England. Those who returned wearing extravagant dress and invoking mannerisms of other European cultures (mainly Italian culture) were ridiculed by British society. These transformed travelers were referred to as "Macaronis" and were (jokingly) said to belong to the "Macaroni Club".[26] As Korte explained, the "traditional Grand Tour was also designed to safeguard the traveller from being led entirely astray. In its original and canonized form, it did not embrace lands which were completely foreign."[27] Grand Tourists were traveling over routes that had previously been transited by countless others, it was not the road less traveled. Instead of creating new paths of experience, the traditional Grand Tour existed as "a world whose otherness was clearly circumscribed and whose effect on a young gentleman's development was therefore calculable."[28] As long as the travelers remained on the established path of the Grand Tour, they could observe other cultures from a safe distance.

In the mid to late 18th century, the "traditional" Grand Tour gave way to a new, broader Grand Tour. Due to advancement in European infrastructure such as the stagecoach network, traveling became more accessible to bourgeois travelers. By the late 18th century, more women traveled although most times they were accompanied by their husbands and families.[29] This also meant an increase in female travel writers such as the famed Mary Wollstonecraft.[30] The Tour became less necessary as an educational experience because of the improvements in the British educational system. Knowledge about other places and cultures were being taught in the

[24] Korte, 42.
[25] Korte, 43.
[26] Korte, 45-46.
[27] Korte, 46.
[28] Korte, 46.
[29] Korte, 43.
[30] Youngs, 47-48.

academies. Travelers also started to literally venture off of the prescribed path, as the Tour expanded into previously unincorporated locales such as the Iberian Peninsula.[31]

Both Korte and Youngs described the mid-late 18th century as a transition stage into the more leisurely type of travel that was prominent in the 19th century. In general, travel became an increasingly personal experience, shifting from the "objective" to the subjective. The subjective travel writer expressed how s/he related to the world in their own unique way. Here Korte used the example of Tobias Smollet's *Travels through France and Italy* (1766) which embodied the basic elements of the Grand Tour, but also included Smollet's personal experiences, introspects, "travel episodes", and details of specific encounters.[32]

Youngs argued that the evolution of travel and travel writing in the mid-late 18th century included the change from the picaresque to the picturesque. Picaresque writing were novels that contained "humorous protagonists and comic adventures", which usually centered on a *picaro* (rogue traveler). The stories of *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) and *Gulliver's Travels* (1726) are examples of the picaresque style.[33] If the picaresque focused on the traveler, then the picturesque highlighted the aesthetics of travel, primarily landscape.

Landscape had always been part of the core of travel writing because land descriptions created space and depth within the narrative. The shift towards more picturesque descriptions of land was inspired by the aesthetics of Romanticism, which increased the importance of landscape.[34] Youngs explained that landscape is subjective, "travellers' accounts of the landscape do not provide neutral versions of it; they do not simply describe it; they *construct* it, too."[35] If beauty was in the eye of the beholder, then so was landscape in the eye (and pen) of the traveler. Korte explained that travel and travel writing became a sort of art form. Landscapes held a "particular aesthetic value if they were reminiscent of a painted landscape, that is of a landscape *picture*" (the picturesque); thus, travelers "consciously sought out views in which the landscape appeared as in a paintings."[36]

It is no coincidence that some of these early picturesque-style travel writers were artists as well. One of the most influential texts on scenic travel was painter William Gilpin's *Three*

[31] Korte, 52-53.
[32] Korte, 54.
[33] Youngs, 38.
[34] Korte, 63.
[35] Youngs, 44.
[36] Korte, 77-78.

Essays: On Picturesque Beauty; On Picturesque Travel, and on Sketching Landscape (1792). In another of Gilpin's earlier works *Observations on the Mountains and Lakes of Cumberland and Westmoreland* (1786), he actually instructed travelers on how to look at specific landscapes and how to strategically position one's self for the most aesthetically pleasing view. The traveler had to take notice of the varying elements of the scenery such as trees, fog, or castles.[37] Korte argued that the focus on the picturesque during the 18th century, "contributed to the emancipation of travelling and the travelogue from the strictures of being 'useful'" or objective.[38] However, by the early 19th century, the picturesque-style of travel and travel writing was already being criticized for being flowery and overly aesthetic. Although this particular style became less popular, the description of the picturesque landscape continued to be a part of travel writing, especially in leisure travel of the 19th century.[39]

Travel and travel writing became increasingly popular for the British in the 19th century because of the progression of transportation technologies and the rise of the middle class.[40] The readership of travel accounts grew due to an increase in literacy and the affordability of consuming literature. Youngs added that writers also began to cater to "general readers". For example, Charles Darwin's account of explorations aboard the *Beagle* was scientific but still intellectually accessible to the average reader.[41]

Nationalism and imperialism became more entrenched in travel and travel writing as well. Youngs described the 19th century an "era of mass emigration to the [British] colonies"; which in turn "produced settlers' letters and diaries, as well as booster literature, aimed at promoting the new settlements to attract new colonists."[42] Places that had been explored in the 18th century became more frequently traveled, such as Oceania, by merchants, settlers, and missionaries. Korte elaborated that because earlier explorers had "discovered" everything, the 19th century explorers focused on interior regions of places such as South America, Australia, and especially Africa.[43] Travel accounts from this time presented "the explorer as a conqueror who claims the country he investigates for the Empire."[44] Nigel Leask stated that in the 19th

[37] Korte, 78-79.
[38] Korte, 81.
[39] Korte, 80.
[40] Youngs, 53-54.
[41] Youngs, 56.
[42] Youngs, 59.
[43] Korte, 87.
[44] Korte, 92.

century (and tracing back to the Early Modern period), travel writing routinely engaged in "empirical protocols" and "rigorous practices of description and notation."[45] This collection of information and intelligence about foreign locales was critical to nationalism and imperialism; by learning about "Other" cultures and peoples, the identity of the nation is structured and reinforced.

As previously stated, landscape continued to be a major theme in 19th century travel and travel writing. With the intertwining of travel and nationalism, landscape entered the focus of the imperial gaze. Korte described the imperial gaze towards land specifically as "the strict separation of descriptions of a country's population from geographical and topographical descriptions, so that the country, which is, after all, the real object of the imperial gaze, comes across as 'unpopulated.'"[46] Land that was depicted as "unpopulated" by native peoples was thus waiting to be inhabited by settlers. The possessive qualities of the imperial gaze in travel writing could be subversive as well. The popular aesthetic-style descriptions of landscape could "veil the ambition to conquer land."[47]

The reign of Queen Victoria, referred to as the Victorian Era (1837-1901), played a crucial role in 19th century travel and travel writing. This period dictated all domains of British society: politics, economics, and culture. An important advancement in Victorian age travel was the birth of the packaged tour. In 1845, Englishman Thomas Cook established one of the first travel agencies in the world, which operated just like modern day travel agencies. Cook organized two particularly notable tours; the first was a tour of the European continent in 1856, and the second was a trip around the world in 1872.[48] For those who could not travel abroad, "exotic" cultures and peoples were brought to them in the form of exhibitions such as World's Fairs and museums, and of course, through travel writing.[49]

On the other side of the Atlantic, the United States of America was a newly independent country. By 1800, it had been less than thirty years since the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the conclusion of the Revolutionary War. The 19th century was a formative

---

[45] Nigel Leask, *Curiosity and the Aesthetics of Travel Writing 1770-1840*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 15. Leask added, "If the traveller disappears, or more importantly, if he fails to gather information (publication may it self be seen in this light as a kind of rite of passage), then his enterprise will have been completely unproductive, except in so far as his failure might serve to stimulate other explorers." Leask, 20.
[46] Korte, 92.
[47] Korte, 93.
[48] Korte, 85. As of 2016, Cook's agency exists as the Thomas Cook Group.
[49] Korte, 85.

time for the U.S. as it sought to establish itself as a legitimate world power, and tried to form its own national identity. However, the U.S. still remained tied to British culture and lifestyle trends, and it adopted Victorian Era culture. In *Exotic Journeys: Exploring the Erotics of U.S. Travel Literature, 1840-1930*, scholar of English Justin D. Edwards argued that American travel accounts were tools of imperialism for the growing American empire and fed into the "strong conscious need for a national identity."[50] Because the U.S. was emerging, and its identity malleable, "tradition and culture had to be developed in relation to other places."[51] American travelers were very much drawn to Britain, France and other European countries, which they considered to be examples of "high civilization". According to Edwards, about thirty-thousand Americans were traveling to Europe every year by 1850.[52] This was basically the American version of the Grand Tour.

Edwards noted that "the popularity of nineteenth-century travel writing arose partially out of a Victorian compulsion to classify, taxonomize, and control the natural world…American travelers often performed the service of charting, mapping, and disclosing the secrets of exotic lands."[53] This echoes Leask's earlier statement about the rigorous "empirical protocols" of travel writing. One of the most interesting outcomes of this type of data collection and taxonomy of the "natural world" was the establishment of racial hierarchies. Both Mary Louise Pratt (*Imperial Eyes*) and Matthew Frye Jacobson (*Barbarian Virtues*) argued that scientists and anthropologists from the 18th century to the early 20th century correlated savagery and barbarism as a trait embedded in the biology of foreign and indigenous peoples.

In *Barbarian Virtues*, Jacobson traced the relationship of evolutionary hierarchies in the representation of non-European/Euro-American peoples. Travel writings of explorers and tourists acted as field research for "armchair" anthropologists, psychiatrists, and other scientists. The late 19th century marked the era of Darwinism and the study of biological evolution. Jacobson observed, "evolutionism became a secular counterpart to an earlier religious discourse of the Christian civilizing mission among the 'heathen.'"[54] In 1877, American anthropologist Lewis Henry Morgan created a more detailed hierarchy in his publication *Ancient Society*. This

[50] Justin D. Edwards, *Exotic Journeys: Exploring the Erotics of U.S. Travel Literature, 1840-1930*, (Hanover: University Press of New England, 2001), 6.
[51] Edwards, 6.
[52] Edwards, 6-7.
[53] Edwards, 5.
[54] Jacobson, 141.

was a continuation of the hierarchies that had already been established a century earlier. This hierarchy was stratified into seven levels: lower savagery, middle savagery, upper savagery, lower barbarism, middle barbarism, upper barbarism, and civilization.[55] Nineteenth century biology (eugenics) determined that "civilized" races were inherently superior, while "savage" races were biologically inferior.[56] The evolution of "science"-based racial hierarchies shaped the way different peoples viewed the "Other", and set the tone for how different peoples would interact with one another as well.

American perceptions of the "Other" consequently dictated domestic and foreign policies. American domestic policy towards the various Indigenous American peoples allowed for imperial (westward) expansion within its own borders. In the 1890s, American Manifest Destiny stretched beyond North America reaching Central and South America, as well as the Pacific. Korte described one's foreignness to another place or culture as "relative and subjective"; adding that "The foreignness of a travelled country is always the result of an act of construction on the part of the perceiver, who defines the country's otherness against his or her own sense of identity, his or her own contexts."[57] Thus, peoples who were "different" or were not "American" were subjected to American imperialism. These peoples were the non-Anglo Saxon and indigenous populations of Cuba, Puerto Rico, Hawai'i, Latin America, and the Philippines. This ideology also included Indigenous Americans and foreign immigrants in the United States.

Jacobson further discussed what he referred to as the American ideology of the "double-edged imperative". If Americans of the late 19th century were the embodiment of a "civilized" people, then the nations they had colonized were home to undeveloped savages. Under the stewardship of the United States, these people could be dragged along the developmental path and made "civil". On the other edge of the imperative, because these people were thought to be undeveloped, they did not deserve equal treatment by Americans.[58] These types of ideologies continued to cross over into travel writing in the last decade of the 19th century. Travel writers wrote about the timeless barbarism of foreign cultures, which "seemed to recommend either

[55] Jacobson, 146-147.
[56] Jacobson, 159. Eugenics reinforced hierarchy even within Europe: English and Germans were at the top, while Irish, Italians, and Jews were at the bottom.
[57] Korte, 20.
[58] Jacobson, 50.

extinction, removal, or reformation under the stewardship of the West."[59] Thus, travel writing was an important colonial tool of the American empire.

In *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, Māori scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith wrote that travel accounts usually exemplified "the experiences and observations of white men whose interactions with indigenous 'societies' or 'peoples' were constructed around their own cultural views of gender and sexuality."[60] Generally speaking, these are the experiences of heterosexual, conservative, Christian men. Thus, Smith continued, "Observations made of indigenous women, for example, resonated with views about the role of women in European societies based on Western notions of culture, religion, race and class."[61] Like other areas of discourse, gender and sexuality are lenses that are more commonly being used to re-think history.

Although fewer in number than their male counterparts, women's travel truly grew during the course of the 19th century. In earlier times, a fear of women traveling existed because it was "dangerous" and their chastity could be at risk. This exaggerated fear declined as infrastructure improved and travel became safer for all travelers.[62] However, women's access to publishing was more restricted than travel itself, which is why women's accounts were usually in diary or letter form, rather than as a book.[63] In Katherine Turner's essay, "From Classical to Imperial: Changing Visions of Turkey in the Eighteenth Century", she argued that in some instances, female travelers had more access to certain areas of culture than their male travelers. For example, Lady Montagu (British) was able to enter Turkish bath houses, harems, and into the social circles of elite Turkish women.[64] Korte added that women were more willing to cross cultural boundaries than males and usually had more personal relationships with people they met along their journeys.[65]

Due to the social and domestic values that structured the lives of British and American females in the Victorian Era, there was a "special propensity in travel writing by women to

[59] Jacobson, 107.
[60] Linda Tuhiwai Smith, 41-42.
[61] Linda Tuhiwai Smith, 41-42.
[62] Korte, 111.
[63] Pratt, 170-171.
[64] Katherine S. H. Turner, "From Classical to Imperial: Changing Visions of Turkey in the Eighteenth Century," in *Travel Writing and Empire: Postcolonial Theory in Transit*. Edited by Steve Clark. (New York: Zed Books, 1999), 116-117.
[65] Korte, 123.

associate journeys with an escape from 'normal' life and to express a counter-discourse to this life."[66] Victorian Age women were in charge of the domestic sphere, ruling over the house and her children. According to Precious McKenzie-Sterns' Ph.D. dissertation *Venturesome Women: Nineteenth-century British Women Travel Writers and Sport* (2007), Victorian women were discouraged from participating in sports or other strenuous physical activities. Upper and upper-middle class women engaged in activities such as croquet, archery, shooting, and horse riding. McKenzie-Stearns said that hunting and shooting by women was particularly scorned upon, even by Queen Victoria herself.[67] Travel, especially outside of urban areas, required physicality and athleticism such hiking, climbing, and riding, often for long distances. McKenzie-Stearns explained, "Victorian women travel writers rejected their submissive positions as 'good wives' at home, and many had no particular 'affinity with domesticity.'"[68]

The way that Victorian Era women found liberation in travel from their expected domesticity is fascinating. It is also refreshing to break out of the monopoly on travel writing held by male travel writers. However, Korte warned that female travelers should not be disassociated or excused from their role as imperial agents, which she criticized as being "feminist wishful thinking".[69] Female travelers like Bird were equally a part of their nation's colonial and imperial ambitions. In the following chapter, I look closer at the travels of British explorer Isabella Bird and her experiences as a Victorian woman in Hawai'i. Bird's travel account exhibited her liberation from the domestic sphere yet she viewed domesticity as a means to "civilize" Native Hawaiian women.

In comparison to gender, sexuality is a more recent lens of analyzing travel writing. In *The Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing*, Youngs provided a sub-section addressing queer travel, although he only wrote about the travels of homosexual white men. Similar to female travel, the opportunity to travel outside of one's own country was liberating for gay men from conservative Western countries. As Youngs stated, "gay people lead an existence that is invisible to straight people who may be their compatriots but who mainly inhabit a world outside

[66] Korte, 126.
[67] Precious McKenzie-Stearns, *Venturesome Women: Nineteenth-Century British Women Travel Writers and Sport*. PhD dissertation. University of South Florida, (2007), 7.
[68] McKenzie-Stearns, 11.
[69] Korte, 125.

homosexuals' one", thus, "gay travellers find themselves more at home when they are abroad, able to recognise and establish an affinity with homosexuals there."[70]

Queer travel is an area of travel writing discourse that definitely needs to be further developed. It is a difficult type of travel to track because of the way homosexuality was viewed throughout the course of history. Travel writers may not have expressed their sexuality publicly or in their own writings for fear of retribution. This lens of analysis is valuable to this thesis because American travel writer Charles Warren Stoddard was a "relatively open" homosexual man and expressed his sexuality in his accounts of the Pacific.[71] Stoddard found comfort in Oceania, traveling four times to Hawai'i and once to Tahiti between the years 1864-1882.[72] Historian John-Gabriel James' Master's thesis *A Lens of Liminality: An Interpretive Biography of Charles Warren Stoddard, 1843-1909* has an excellent discussion of Stoddard's sexuality and travels in the Pacific, primarily through his account *South Sea Idyls* (1873).[73] Like female travel, the study of queer travels brings another marginalized voice into the foray of travel writing discourse.

Travel and Travel Writing in 19th Century Hawai'i

European produced travel writings about Hawai'i began in the late 18th century, following the arrival of Capt. James Cook, and subsequent visits by other British explorers and merchants, such as Capt. George Vancouver and Simon Metcalf. Although mostly British travelers came to Hawai'i, well-known French explorer Jean-Francois de la Perouse did visit Hawai'i during this time as well. Throughout the late 18th century and very early 19th century, the population of non-Kānaka living in Hawai'i was extremely small, consisting of those who were left behind or chose to stay behind. The Hawaiian archipelago was simultaneously undergoing the process of conquering and unification by Kamehameha I, which may have dissuaded additional settlement.

---

[70] Youngs, 140.

[71] John-Gabriel James, *A Lens of Liminality: An Interpretive Biography of Charles Warren Stoddard, 1843-1909*. Master's thesis, University of Hawaii Mānoa, (2004), xxvi. James discussed the history of how homosexuality was viewed in the 19th century. The terms "homosexuality" and "heterosexuality" are actually anachronistic to most of the 19th century. It was not until the late 19th century when the terms made distinct and stigmatized. There was a large gray area between homosocial and homosexual behavior between men. James, 46, 139.

[72] James, 146.

[73] According to James, Stoddard was able to write about his intimate relationships with young Tahitian and Hawaiian men in this account. In Hawai'i, Stoddard wrote about two relationships, one with "Kana-ana" on Moloka'i and another with "Kane-aloha" of Hilo.

As Oceania (the Pacific Northwest and South Pacific) became increasingly traversed and viewed as a region for both European and American economic exploit, Hawai‘i too became a part of the Pacific economy (sandalwood and whaling). The Hawaiian Islands were a stopping point for many merchant, trading, and whaling ships. In turn this created a local economy to service these sailors and seamen during their stays such as the creation of inns and saloons, the prostitution of Native Hawaiian women, and the selling of various provisions. For these expeditions and merchant travels, accounts were kept in the form of notes, journals, and letters, not only by the respective captains but crewmembers as well.

Following the death of Kamehameha I and the end of ‘ai kapu in 1819, the first wave of missionaries from the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Mission (ABCFM) arrived in 1820. The first generations of missionaries produced letters, journals, and diaries about their initial experiences in Hawai‘i and their interactions with Kānaka ‘Ōiwi and other white settlers. Although the missionaries were settlers, as opposed to visitors, their accounts are an important part of the history of travel writing about Hawai‘i. In their effort to convert Kānaka to Christianity, they were major contributors to the negative narratives about Native Hawaiians being uncivilized, too sexual, and inferior. These narratives rationalized the American missionary project. Additionally, it was missionary descendants such as Henry M. Whitney and Lorrin Thurston who became promoters of travel and further white settlement in the late 19th century.

It is extremely difficult to designate an exact starting point for leisure travel to Hawai‘i. To do that, one would need to find the first “leisure traveler” which is an impossible task. However, it is clear that there was a budding foundation of leisure travel culture and tourist promotion in the 1860s and 1870s. In 1866, Mark Twain visited Hawai‘i for six months and wrote his account through letters published in the California newspaper *The Sacramento Union*.[74] In the introductory chapter (“Ka Ha‘alele”), I explained that in 1875, Henry M. Whitney published the very first guidebook for the promotion of Hawai‘i, *The Hawaiian Guide Book*. Also in the same year, Thomas G. Thrum started publishing *Thrum’s Annual*, which was an almanac for travelers and settlers. By the mid-1880s, the monthly issued *Paradise of the Pacific* guide book had begun its long run of circulation. In the same way that infrastructure

[74] Kaplan, 55. Twain could not find a venue to publish his letters as a book, so he ended up adding those writings to the end of *Roughing It* (1872).

helped expand travel on the European continent, the advancements of roads, trails, and transportation greatly increased travel within the Hawaiian Islands. The Hawaiian Kingdom was a country that thought of itself as being on par with any Western country. With most of the infrastructural improvements being centered in and around Honolulu, it became the metropolitan and cosmopolitan city of the Pacific. Hawai‘i continued to be a convenient stopping point for all types of trans-Pacific travelers.

The promotion of Hawai‘i in the late 19th century had a dual purpose: to draw in visitors and to entice Euro-American settlers. Travel promotion was mostly driven by the prominent and wealthy Euro-American citizens of the Hawaiian Kingdom who were interconnected through economics, politics, and social life. Money generated by visitors supplemented the booming but unstable sugar economy. As a type of economy, tourism was a low risk in the late 19th century. The industry required basic infrastructure, which the Kingdom had already been improving. Meanwhile the product to be exported, “paradise”, was already there. The real monetary investment went into promotion (travel writing, lectures, exhibitions, advertisements, etc.) and individual enterprises catering to travelers (hotels, inns, horse rentals, etc.). One of the interesting ways the Kingdom directly benefitted from the industry was the enforcement of a $2 tax at port for arriving travelers; the money supported the Queen’s Hospital.[75]

On the other hand, the promotion of Hawai‘i for Euro-American settlers was viewed as a long-term strategy to boost the sugar industry and the growing power of the Euro-American elite of Hawai‘i. In fact, the reason for Mark Twain’s travel to Hawai‘i was to be a scout for sugar investors and consumers from California, he “faithfully promoted the sugar trade and U.S. economic and political interest in Hawaii.”[76] Settlers could purchase land and become overseers on their respective plantations. More obviously, an influx of settlers would increase the Euro-American population that was greatly outnumbered by Native Hawaiians.

In hindsight, this settler colonial project was both successful and unsuccessful. Although the Euro-American population steadily grew over time, they could never out-populate the combined number of immigrant laborers from China, Japan, Korea, and the Philippines. However, the powerful Euro-American families that controlled sugar, banking, shipping,

[75] Whitney, *The Hawaiian Guide Book*, 6-7.
[76] Kaplan, 55.

development, tourism, and politics, maintained, if not increased, their grip on Hawai‘i throughout most of the 20th century.

Without the benefit of television, radio, and of course the internet, promotion through literature was extremely significant to the emerging travel industry of 19th century Hawai‘i. Travel writing could be disseminated relatively quickly and sent to anywhere on the globe. Promotional materials such as guide books or pamphlets produced in Hawai‘i were mainly sent to the west coast of the United States, as San Francisco was the gateway into the Pacific. Personal accounts of travelers had a more scattered spread of distribution as their accounts were published in their home regions. Visuals such as photographs or sketches were included in publications as well. The presence of visuals (especially photographs) in travel writings grew over the years, most likely due to the advancement of technology and the decrease of printing costs.

Two overarching themes encompassed travel writing produced about late 19th century Hawai‘i: landscape and Kānaka ‘Ōiwi. From the pens and printing presses of British and Euro-American travel writers spawned colonial and imperial narratives that actively undermined Native Hawaiian culture, history, and self-governance, all while directly and indirectly supporting American imperialism and colonization. Travel writing became the vehicle to circulate these narratives in the United States, Britain, and to the far reaches of the globe.

From the 19th century to the present, the aesthetic of Hawaiian landscape has always been the main attraction for visitors and settlers: the epitome of the picturesque. Travel writing imagined the Hawaiian landscape as an empty, virgin space waiting to be explored by travelers and farmed by settlers. The recruitment for Euro-American settlers became more blatant once the Territorial Government was established post-1900 as seen in the May 1904 article in the *Paradise of the Pacific* titled, “A White Farmer’s Field in Hawai‘i”.[77] In 1903, Territorial Governor, Sanford Dole requested to the Hawai‘i Legislature:

> …it would be a good idea for the Legislature to appropriate a sum of money for compiling and publishing a pamphlet setting forth a list of all the public lands available for settlers, together with location, character of soil and climate for such and such crops, and instructions as to how they could be obtained.[78]

[77] Other settler recruitments: “A Young Woman’s Chances in Hawaii” (November 1904), “A Young Man’s Chances in Hawaii” (May 1903), and “Facts for Hawaiian Homeseekers” (December 1906).
[78] Elinor Langton, “A White Farmer’s Field,” in *Paradise of the Pacific*, edited by J. J. Williams, (Honolulu, March 1903), 7.

The very first guide books produced in 1875, Whitney's *The Hawaiian Guide Book* and Thrum's *Annual*, both included information geared towards farming settlers such as climate charts, tax lists, available social institutions, etc.

In *Barbarian Virtues*, Matthey Frye Jacobson used the phrase "waste spaces" in reference to the way Americans saw foreign landscapes because they thought indigenous peoples were not using land to its full potential. The phrase "waste spaces" actually originated from Theodore Roosevelt's book *The Winning of the West (1889-1896)*. If the fertile, virgin lands were being squandered then these lands needed to be controlled by American farmers who could exploit the land for profit. In 1879, British traveler Constance Fredericka Gordon Cumming arrived in Hawai'i and wrote what would become her travelogue *Fire Fountains: The Kingdom of Hawai'i, Its Volcanoes, and the History of its Missions* (1883). As scholar Andrea Feeser stated, Gordon Cumming had high praise for the sugar industry's use of Hawaiian land, while criticizing the agricultural and conservational practices of Kānaka 'Ōiwi.[79] Gordon Cumming's cultural conditioning "affected what [she] saw and did not see" and her ethnocentrism shaped her interpretation of land management.[80] As Mary Louise Pratt explained in *Imperial Eyes:*

> The European improving eye produces subsistence habitats as 'empty' landscapes, meaningful only in terms of a capitalist future and of their potential for producing a marketable surplus. From the point of view of their inhabitants, of course, these same spaces are lived as intensely humanized, saturated with local history and meaning, where plants, creatures, and geographical formations have names, uses, symbolic functions, histories, places in indigenous knowledge formations.[81]

The envisioning of landscape (re)moved Native Hawaiians and other indigenous peoples to the background; blended into the landscape and into the wild, as if their culture and history did not exist. This removal was also reinforced by the expositions and museum exhibitions of the late 19th century. Indigenous peoples and cultures were often placed in the category of "natural history" because they were deemed to be closer to animals than they were to humans.[82]

---

[79] Andrea Feeser, "Constance Fredericka Gordon Cumming's "Picturesque" Vision: A Christian, Westernized Hawai'i," in *Issues in Travel Writing: Empire, Spectacle, and Displacement.* Edited by Kristi Siegel, (New York: Peter Lang, 2002), 86.
[80] Feeser, 88-89.
[81] Pratt, 61.
[82] Jacobson, 109-111.

If landscape was a part of the colonial vision, then what is ʻāina? Does it simply translate to "land"? ʻĀina is a space that inhibits the tangible and intangible. Water, dirt, flora, fauna, wind, rain, and other geographic features are layered with specific inoa (names) and moʻolelo (histories). ʻĀina is often said to be "that which feeds", providing Kānaka ʻŌiwi with enough resources from mauka to makai to be self-subsistent. The ʻāina "landscape" is not empty and devoid of life, it sustains life. In the *Kumulipo*, one of the Hawaiian cosmologies, ʻāina and Kānaka are intrinsically connected as shown in the moʻolelo of Papahānaumoku, Wākea, and Hoʻohōkūkalani. Papa (Earth-mother) and Wākea (Sky-father) procreated and Papa birthed the main Hawaiian Islands. Wākea also procreated with the celestial daughter, Hoʻohōkūkalani. Her first child was stillborn and was buried in the lepo (soil). From the stillborn fetus sprouted the first kalo, named Hāloanakalaukapalili. Hoʻohōkūkalani and Wākea's second child became the first Kanaka ʻŌiwi, and was named Hāloa. In this moʻolelo, ʻāina and Kānaka are not only physically connected but genealogically connected as well. This connection is reflected in the ʻōlelo noʻeau, "He aliʻi ka ʻāina, he kauwā ke kanaka" (The land is chief, the people are its servants).[83] The relationship between ʻāina and Kānaka is reciprocal.

The large planation style management of the sugar industry was an agricultural method that was new to the Hawaiian Islands. Although kalo had always been the staple food source of Native Hawaiians, it was less invasive and less labor intensive. The production of sugar in Hawaiʻi required large parcels of land (displacement of Kānaka ʻŌiwi), a lot of workers (immigration labor), and an enormous quantity of water (water diversion). The sugar industry permanently altered the ʻāina, and its ramifications are still felt today. Another point to consider is that sugar is not a subsistence crop like kalo because it cannot feed people, sugar was strictly grown for economic gain.

Landscape in travel writing actively erased ʻāina and attempted to severe the connection between ʻāina and Kānaka. In the section "From Picturesque Hawaii" in *Paradise of the Pacific* (1895), the editor wrote that land, "now under cultivation was comparatively valueless until foreign enterprise and capital reclaimed it."[84] This narrative promoted the idea that foreign settlers knew the land better than the Kānaka ʻŌiwi who were genealogically tied to ʻāina. Travel

[83] Mary Kawena Pukui, *ʻŌlelo Noʻeau*, 62.
[84] J. J. Williams, *Paradise of the Pacific*, (Honolulu, 1895), 53.

writing prostituted the "virgin" landscape, ʻāina was stripped bare of its history and its people, displayed for the longing gaze of travelers and settlers.

If "good" and "bad" were black and white, Native Hawaiians were mostly in the gray area in the eyes of travel writers. "Are Kānaka ʻŌiwi civilized or uncivilized?" was the most pressing question in travel writing throughout the 19th century and early 20th century. The answer depended on the individual author but more importantly context was the deciding factor. The definiton of civility, outlined by travel writers, is clear: be Christian and behave like a Westerner. One clear demarcation between civilized and uncivilized was the arrival of the ABCFM in 1820. Any Native Hawaiians who had lived pre-1820 were inherently uncivilized, often called savages or heathens by writers. Furthermore, any Native Hawaiians who continued to practice aspects of Hawaiian culture pre-1820 (dress, chanting, tattooing, eating style, etc.) were also regarded as uncivilized. However, even "civilized" Kānaka ʻŌiwi were never really treated or depicted as equals to Euro-Americans or British people. There was always an underlying sense of the travel writer's perceived superiority. True to the "double-edged imperative", travel writers saw Native Hawaiians as being on the path to Western progress, but they could never truly be Westerners.

Whether deemed "civilized" or "uncivilized", Kānaka ʻŌiwi were associated with negative attributes such as laziness, lying, and stealing. These same traits were placed upon other indigenous peoples of the Pacific, indigenous Americans, and Blacks in the United States. Mark Twain excessively complained about Native Hawaiians, calling them "liars of 'monstrous incredible' proportion."[85] He was also infuriated at the Kānaka guides for knowingly selling him a bad horse and uncomfortable saddle. In *Anarchy of Empire*, Kaplan stated that Twain's "stereotype of the conniving native inadvertently acknowledges the traveler's foreignness and vulnerability, and his dependence on native knowledge and resources to gain access to the landscape."[86] Perhaps Twain was just a bad horse rider but instead of admitting his shortcomings, he pursued an easy target.

Laziness is an intriguing stereotype because the term is subjective to one's culture. In the context of British and American travel writing, laziness was equated as the absence of labor and capital. Laziness was a stereotype first introduced by the ABCFM missionaries who were critical of Native Hawaiian "idleness and laziness." This is particularly because labor and "hard work"

[85] Kaplan, 59.
[86] Kaplan, 65.

are Christian values, reinforced by the Christian Bible.[87] The perceived "laziness" of Kānaka was a direct result of the friction between Western capitalism and ʻāina subsistence. As previously stated, the propagation of sugar was incredibly labor intensive and sugar is not a staple subsistence crop. The recruitment of Native Hawaiian labor for sugar plantations was not very successful. Why would a Native Hawaiian toil all day in the sun to produce an non-nutritional crop in exchange for money, when the Kanaka could do a much less labor intensive type of agriculture and directly benefit from the product? Kaplan stated that Native Hawaiian resistance to foreign ideas of labor "was rendered as the deficiency of the civilized qualities of individual ambition, hard work, and collective responsibility. Similar to language characterizing blacks in the South and North, 'idleness' was increasingly viewed as an innate racial characteristic."[88] This perceived "laziness" was one of the causes for considering Chinese labor on Hawaiian sugar plantations. Twain himself advocated for Chinese labor, and of course, they would be supervised by white overseers.[89]

The criticisms of laziness by travel writers like Twain towards Kānaka ʻŌiwi is quite a hypocrisy. Kaplan explained:

> As Hawaiians were forced into a postlapsarian capitalist system of commodified labor, the image of Hawaiian paradise as a place without labor or history became increasingly available as a commodity to attract foreign settlers and tourists. Racial discourse splits the same qualities of a labor-free Eden into opposing values. The reputed indolence of Hawaiians derided as a form of racial degradation becomes lauded as a natural luxury, as leisure or vacation, for white residents and travelers.[90]

Whereas Native Hawaiians were accused of being lazy, to relax in paradise is the very idea that attracted travelers and settlers to Hawaiʻi. Laziness is acceptable for white people but unacceptable for the indigenous.

Previously I discussed the racial hierarchies created by European and American scientists and anthropologists, which were reinforced by travel writers. There were various types of hierarchies; some broad and some that only pertained to specific regions. A hierarchy of Oceania is found in Robert Louis Stevenson's travelogue *In the South Seas* (1896). Stevenson is one of

[87] Kaplan, 79.
[88] Kaplan, 79-80.
[89] Kaplan, 81.
[90] Kaplan, 80.

the most celebrated writers of the 19th century.[91] He traveled all over the Pacific to places such as Hawai‘i, Tahiti, New Zealand, and Kiribati. *In the South Seas* is Stevenson's account of his travels to the Marquesas, the Paumotus (Tuamotus), and the Kiritbati (Gilbert Islands).

Stevenson's hierarchy of the "civility" of Pacific peoples was ranked as such: Native Hawaiians, Sāmoans, and Tahitians at the top, and Māori and Marquesans at the absolute bottom.[92] He also ranked peoples based on physical appearance: he found Tahitians and Marquesans to be most attractive, followed by I-Kiribati, and then Tuamotuans last.[93] He most likely though highly of Hawaiians because he had spent time in Hawai‘i and had struck up a friendship with the royal family, most notably Princess Ka‘iulani. Stevenson considered the Marquesans to be uncivilized because of their rumoured cannibalism. Although Stevenson had only been relayed second-hand accounts of cannibalism; these accounts were of ritualistic consumption of flesh, not cannibalism for actual nourishment. He was quite infatuated with the thought of Marquesan cannibalism, even dedicating a section to cannibalism titled "Long-Pig", which was a metaphor for a human sacrifice. Like laziness and thievery, cannibalism was yet another stereotypical trope casted over many indigenous peoples throughout history.

The government of the Hawaiian Kingdom was a target of criticism as travel writers often inserted their own political commentary. Unsurprisingly it was the Euro-American writers who were the most critical of the Hawaiian monarchy. They made disparaging racist remarks towards various ali‘i as well as chastised any government policies that negatively affected Euro-American settlers. By attacking ali‘i and government policies, travel writers were mudslinging on the authority of Hawaiian monarchial rule. Mark Twain even ridiculed the Kingdom Legislature which mostly consisted of Native Hawaiians. Twain sat in on the Legislative session and mocked their Hawaiian names and their Western clothing. Kaplan stated that it was as if Twain saw Native Hawaiian officials as "children at play mimicking adults."[94]

For Twain and other American writers, the success of a non-white sovereign monarchy posed a serious reflection of the way Blacks and other minorities were treated in America.

---

[91] Stevenson lived only a short life due to his poor health; his adventures into the Pacific represent the last years of his life (1888-1894). Stevenson lived out the final years in Sāmoa, where he earned the name "Tusitala". His travels happened in two segments. In 1888, Stevenson left San Francisco on the schooner *Casco* to Hawai‘i, and then onto the Marquesas and Tuamotus. After this trip, he returned to Hawai‘i in 1889 and boarded the *Equator*, which took him to Kiribati.

[92] Robert Louis Stevenson, *In the South Seas*, (London: Chatto and Windus, 1900),13-14, 94.

[93] Stevenson, 26, 169, 222.

[94] Kaplan, 82-83.

Kaplan asked, "How would American readers of Twain in 1866 have perceived the image of dark-skinned Hawaiians presiding over white men?"[95] It must have been a scary thought for the ethnocentric Euro-American travelers. If Native Hawaiians were capable of self-rule, then so were Blacks and Indigenous Americans. By disregarding and belittling the ability of an indigenous government, writers continued to portray Kānaka as inferiors. This tracks back to the notion that Kānaka ʻŌiwi would never be seen as equals even if they were considered to be "civilized".

Declension narratives about Kānaka ʻŌiwi were another commonplace trope in travel writing throughout the late 19th century. The popular narrative of the "vanishing" Native Hawaiian race invited visitors and settlers to inhabit Hawaiʻi, which worked in tandem with the depiction of an empty landscape. If the Hawaiians were going extinct, then why shouldn't settlers take the land? The primary cause of depopulation was the introduction of foreign diseases and the various 19th century epidemics; however, travel writers often downplayed or completely disregarded this factor and tended to place the blame on Native Hawaiians.[96]

Many travel writers wrote that war, infanticide/abortion, sacrifice, and capital punishment of the "ancient days" caused Native Hawaiian depopulation. These narratives made their way into the Hawaiian histories written by Euro-American settlers throughout the 19th and 20th century. In the 1964 essay, "On Being Hawaiian", Native Hawaiian scholar John Dominis Holt fiercely condemned these narratives. He said that although there are records of these acts, it is impossible quantify the extent to which they were committed, especially practices such as infanticide and sacrifice. Holt exclaimed that these narratives were "used to propagandize against the worth of the classic Hawaiian culture, in order to prove that newly introduced ideas and practices were vastly superior to the ones Hawaians [sic] had lived quite successfully for a thousand years."[97]

Travel writers had a peculiar obsession with artifacts, particularly the collection of bones from Kānaka ʻŌiwi burial sites. Bone collecting was mentioned in Whitney's *The Hawaiian Guide Book* and in H. N. Moseley's *Notes by a Naturalist*. Whitney said that hundreds of skulls

[95] Kaplan, 84.
[96] For more information on disease and epidemics in Hawaiʻi, see: Kerri A. Inglis, *Maʻi Lepera: Disease and Displacement in Nineteenth-Century Hawaiʻi*, (Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press, 2013). David E. Stannard, *Before the Horror: The Population of Hawaiʻi on the Eve of Western Contact*, (Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press, 1989). Wilcox, Bruce A. and Kepā Maly. "Hawaiian Epidemics and Cultural Collapse: A Social-Ecological Perspective".
[97] John Dominis Holt, "On Being Hawaiian", Topgallant Publishing Co. Ltd, (1974), 15.

were taken from the shores of Waiʻalae on Oʻahu.[98] Coastal areas were popular places for Hawaiian burials because sand is the easiest material to dig into. Kānaka ʻŌiwi consider iwi (bones) as the most important part of person's remains because they hold mana. The iwi were always buried or hidden from sight (such as in caves), especially if they belonged to an aliʻi. To take another's bones was to possess their mana.

In *Anarchy of Empire*, Kaplan believed that Mark Twain was "obsessed with death and its races, as though death were a signature of Hawaiian culture."[99] For example, upon the passing of Kuhina Nui Victoria Kamāmalu, Twain desired to see her body lying in state. However, due to restrictions, Twain was not able to see her, leaving him greatly disappointed and irritated.[100] Like other travelers and settlers, Twain was guilty of bone collecting and turned the bodies of Native Hawaiians "into exotic sites for the projection of colonial desire."[101] On an excursion to the area around Lēʻahi (Diamond Head), Twain and his party scavenged a known burial site as if they were vultures, and he took arm and leg bones from the site. He noted that skulls were the most prized, but they had already been taken by previous scavengers. If cannibalism is the consumption of another human being, Kaplan argued perhaps these bone collecting travelers were the real cannibals and headhunters.[102]

Additionally, Kaplan stated that "Twain's obsession with relics turns the complexity of the historical present into a mere overlay of a deeper dead past by rendering what appears as authentic native culture as necessarily dead or dying."[103] In *Imperial* Eyes, Mary Louise Pratt explained the metaphorical extinction of non-European (and non-Euro-American) peoples through Western archeology; "To revive indigenous history and culture as archaeology is to revive them *as dead*. The gesture simultaneously rescues them from European forgetfulness and reassigns them to a departed age."[104] The voyeurism of death in travel writing is disturbing, especially considering the importance of iwi to Native Hawaiians. Other places of death, like the Nuʻuanu Pali, was a must see location for travelers. The exhumation of iwi and touring of historical sites was physical proof to readers that Kānaka ʻŌiwi were of the past, a dying culture.

[98] Whitney, *The Hawaiian Guide Book*, 26.
[99] Kaplan, 68.
[100] Kaplan, 69-70.
[101] Kaplan, 66.
[102] Kaplan, 68-69.
[103] Kaplan, 69.
[104] Pratt, 134.

Again, the promulgation of death reinforced declension narratives, the more it was said, the more it was "true".

If travel writers were not being occupied with death, they were writing about disease, particularly leprosy. Leprosy, also called Hansen's disease, was an epidemic that came to Hawai'i in the 1820s. However, it was not officially recognized as a major problem until 1865, when Lota Kapuāiwa (Kamehameha V) passed "An Act to Prevent the Spread of Leprosy". This act forced any person considered to be afflicted with the disease into quarantine on the Makanalua Peninsula, more commonly referred to as Kalaupapa.[105] Seven to eight thousand people of varying ethnicities were sent to the peninsula between 1866 and 1969, Kānaka 'Ōiwi being the majority.

In the late 19th century, the pathology of Hansen's disease was unknown; therefore patients (and their families) were stigmatized by society. This stigma was strongly influenced by Judeo-Christian beliefs, which associated the afflicted with being unclean or unholy; thus, the disease was viewed as the punishment for being "uncivilized".[106] Kānaka had their own name for the disease: ma'i ho'oka'awale 'ohana, the disease that separated family. One way patients were able to keep connected to their families was through the practice of mea kōkua (helpers). By 1900, an estimated four to five hundred people voluntarily went to Makanalua to serve as mea kōkua. Mea kōkua tended to the needs of the patients, such farming and food preparation.[107]

Travel writers were drawn to the leprosy settlement in a twisted blend of both awe and horror, even though they were not allowed to physically visit. In the eyes of the travel writers, patients were an outcaste population of Hawaiian society and thus a spectacle. The afflictions of these patients were exploited in the portrayal of Hawai'i as an exotic locale. Consequently, the stigma of the Kalaupapa settlement came to define the entire island of Moloka'i. In travel writing, Moloka'i was rarely ever discussed outside of its relation to the settlement on Makanalua. In a way, the unfortunate situation of these patients and the stigma they endured may

[105] The entire peninsula is mistakenly referred to as Kalaupapa, however, Kalaupapa is just one ahupua'a (land section) of the Makanalua peninsula. The Kalawao ahupua'a is located on the eastern side, the Makanalua ahupua'a is in the middle, and Kalaupapa is located on the western side. The peninsula is isolated from the main landmass of the island; the ocean surrounds the north, east, and west faces and steep, rising sea cliffs create the southern border. Previous to 1865, there were already Native Hawaiian residents (non-patients) who called the peninsula their home.
[106] Kerri A. Inglis, *Ma'i Lepera: Disease and Displacement in Nineteenth-Century Hawai'i*, (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2013), 41.
[107] Inglis, 84-87.

have protected Moloka‘i from the effects of commercial development and mass tourism as seen on other islands.

Although the pending extinction of Native Hawaiians was a central narrative of late 19th century travel writing, the concept of depopulation and extinction is actually quite problematic. Was there a decline in Kānaka ‘Ōiwi? The answer is both yes and no, based on the 19th century definition of indigenous Hawaiians. Kānaka who were full-blooded were called “native Hawaiians” (lowercase n) while mixed-Hawaiians were labeled as “half-caste” or “half-white”. These categories were constructs of the Western idealogy of blood quantum. Whereas in Hawaiian culture, genealogy is the principle determinant of who is Hawaiian; there are no distinctions between “native Hawaiian” and “half-caste”, nor does having a higher blood quantum make a person a more “real” Hawaiian. Even high ranking ali‘i like Queen Emma Rooke and Princess Victoria Ka‘iulani were not “native Hawaiians”. Furthermore, the choice of travel writers to label a Kānaka ‘Ōiwi as “half-white” was a conscious decision to strip away his or her genealogy. It was true that the population of “native Hawaiians” did rapidly decline during the 19th century, however the overall population of Kānaka ‘Ōiwi (no blood quantum distinction) was quickly rising.

So what is the culmination of the two major travel writing themes of landscape and Kānaka ‘Ōiwi? The narratives of an empty landscape and a dying savage race, incapable of self rule, suggested that Hawai‘i was destined to be controlled by Euro-Americans settlers and eventually the American government. If Americans out-settled the native population, America could have its own type of pseudo-colony in the Pacific. Although the Euro-Americans did not out-settle Kānaka, these narratives rationalized the overthrow of the Kingdom in 1893 and America’s “annexation” of Hawai‘i in 1898. The paternalistic attitude of America suggested that Hawai‘i and Native Hawaiians “needed” American protection and guidance. This was the same American perspective towards Cuba, the Philippines, and Puerto Rico.

Compared to the other locales, Hawai‘i had the most realistic chance at becoming an American territory. Post-1893 overthrow, the Euro-American governed Republic became the new governmental structure of Hawai‘i. The main goal of the Republic was to offer up Hawai‘i to the U.S. via annexation, which ended up taking three attempts due to Kānaka ‘Ōiwi resistance. As the Republic waited for annexation, the harsher narratives about Kānaka ‘Ōiwi seemed to soften in the attempt to portray Kānaka as being worthy Americans. The shifting narrative said

that Native Hawaiians were not good enough to self-rule but they were good enough to be model American citizens.

The reason for this shift was the American fear of incorporating foreigners (minorities) into white American society. As Amy Kaplan stated in *Anarchy of Empire*, "while the United States strove to nationalize and domesticate foreign territories and peoples, annexation threatened to incorporate non-white foreign subjects into the republic in away that was perceived to undermine the nation as a domestic space."[108] This very fear is one of the leading reasons why Hawai'i remained a territory for such a long period, from 1898-1959. It was not just the Kānaka 'Ōiwi population that was feared, it was also the growing population of Asian immigrant sugar workers. The United States was not going to fully incorporate a territory in which minorities were the majority, especially during a time of intense American xenophobia towards varying Asian cultures.

[108] Kaplan, 29.

-Ch. 2-
Producing Paradise: the "Imagined Hawai‘i in the 1870s"

I Kahiki no ka hao, o ke ki‘o ana i Hawai‘i nei.
In Kahiki was the iron; in Hawai‘i, the rusting.
Perhaps the foreigner was a good person while he was at home, but here he grows careless with his behavior. (ON1179)
-Mary Kawena Pukui, *‘Ōlelo No‘eau: Hawaiian Proverbs and Poetical Sayings.*

> Their names are Hawaii, Maui, Lanai, Kahoolawe, Molokai, Oahu, Kauai, and Niihau…They possess the general attractive characteristics of the tropical Polynesian groups—that perfection of climate and most charming scenery which suggest to the sea-worn traveler Paradise and the Garden of Eden.[1]
> –Henry M. Whitney, *The Hawaiian Guide Book*, 1875.

The preceding description originates from the opening pages of Henry M. Whitney's 1875 publication *The Hawaiian Guide Book*. Travel writings such as *The Hawaiian Guide Book* attempted to promote Hawai‘i to a mass audience as a place for travelers, both visitors and settlers. Writers like Whitney imagined Hawai‘i as the "paradise of the Pacific", a land of opportunity, pleasure, and settlement; and a space that could be possessed and capitalized on by white travelers (specifically Euro-Americans).

In this chapter, I explore how travel writers used narrative themes about Kānaka ‘Ōiwi to create the 1870s version of the "Imagined Hawai‘i" for prospective travelers. Additionally, I uncover how some travel writers were confronted by their misperceptions about Hawai‘i and Native Hawaiians. The travel writings that I unpack in this chapter are *Paradise in the Pacific; A Book of Travel, Adventure, and Facts in the Sandwich Islands* by William Root Bliss (1873), Isabella Bird's *The Hawaiian Archipelago* (1875), Whitney's *The Hawaiian Guide Book* (1875), and lastly, *Notes by a Naturalist on the Challenger 1872-1876* by Henry Nottidge "H. N." Moseley (1879). Bliss (American), Bird (British), and Moseley (British) were travelers who noted their respective experiences in the form of personal accounts. Whitney was a citizen of the Hawaiian Kingdom who produced his own guide book in order to provide information and statistics for prospective visitors and settlers.

By surveying a diverse selection of travel writing, the nuances and opinions of each writer can be compared and contrasted. Each writer's experience or agenda dictated the occurrence of a particular narrative(s). For example, William Root Bliss was an American who

[1] Henry M. Whitney, *The Hawaiian Guide Book*, (Honolulu: self published, 1875), 3.

focused a lot of his attention on the Hawai‘i’s government and monarchy. He was heavily critical of the ability of Native Hawaiians to self-rule. Additionally, he seemed to have no real interest in understanding Native Hawaiians or their culture. In contrast, British explorer Isabella Bird stayed six months in Hawai‘i, which allowed for many interactions with Kānaka ‘Ōiwi, making her experience completely different than that of Bliss. Bird was less critical of the monarchy and Kingdom politics, but more critical of Native Hawaiian lifestyles and culture (particularly those she considered “uncivilized”).

I chose to focus on these five texts because they are clustered within a relatively short span of time, which makes their individual contexts more closely relatable. Although foreign travel accounts pre-date the 1870s, Whitney’s publication marked the beginning of Hawai‘i’s travel industry. The travel industry at this time was nothing like the mass tourism of the present. In place of “Waikīkī”, the cornerstone locale of the contemporary industry; there was Waikīkī, a swampy, fertile area for agriculture. There was no hula kitsch, no commercial lū‘au, and no hapa haole music. As for sight-seeing, Kīlauea volcano on Hawai‘i Island was by far the premier attraction for serious travelers. Without the establishment of a reliable transportation network and infrastructure, sightseeing mostly took place on O‘ahu, mainly focused within Honolulu and its surrounding areas.

Hawai‘i’s infrastructure was slowly improving. In the two decades leading up to the 1870s, the Hawaiian Kingdom worked to improve inter-island shipping as well as establishing more roads for horses and carts.[2] Throughout the late 19th century, transportation greatly improved within the Kingdom with the building of major roadways, railroads, etc. These advancements greatly increased the mobility of travelers (and citizens).

The Kingdom’s economy had recently transitioned from whaling to sugar production.[3] Sugar greatly shaped and changed many aspects of Hawai‘i, such as the establishment of immigrant labor and less than sustainable natural resource management. Sugar planters had a larger role in the Kingdom’s foreign and domestic affairs, fighting for laws and legislation that would bolster the island’s sugar industry, most notably the Reciprocity Treaty of 1875. This treaty allowed duty-free trade of certain goods (most importantly sugar from Hawai‘i) between Hawai‘i and the Unites States, and later allowed the U.S. military to control Pu‘uloa (Pearl

[2] Ralph Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom, vol. 2, 1854-1874, Twenty Critical Years.* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1953), 3.
[3] Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom, vol. 2, 1854-1874, Twenty Critical Years.* 135.

River/Pearl Harbor).[4] The Reciprocity Treaty was a much needed stimulate for the growing sugar industry.

Within the decade of the 1870s, the Hawaiian Kingdom had three different mōʻī: Lota Kapuāiwa (1963-1972), Lunalilo (1973-1974), and Kalākaua (1974-1891). Lunalilo was the first elected mōʻī of the Kingdom, chosen by popular vote. Kalākaua was elected as mōʻī by the Kingdom's Legislature, and was the first non-Kamehameha to take the throne. During this period, these three monarchs ruled under the 1864 Constitution (1864-1887) established by Lota Kapuāiwa. Lota's inspiration for creating the 1864 constitution stemmed from his discontent with the 1852 Constitution he inherited when he took the throne. The 1852 Constitution made the Kingdom more democratic, Lota saw the 1852 Constitution as a hinderance to or restrictive of the power of the mōʻī.[5] In short, the 1864 Constitution successfully returned more power to the position of mōʻī.[6] This drew sharp criticism from Euro-American citizens and travelers (and travel writers) because a more powerful monarchy meant less "democracy"; less democracy did not favor foreigners.

Paradise in the Pacific; A Book of Travel, Adventure, and Facts in the Sandwich Islands by William Root Bliss (1873)

New Yorker William Root Bliss was an entrepreneur, and a writer in his spare,, time. He graduated from Yale, where he was member of the famous Skull and Bones society.[7] Bliss' writings covered the histories of New England as well as his travels abroad. He ventured to places such as the West Indies, Europe, Central America, and of course, the Hawaiian Islands in

[4] Many Kānaka ʻŌiwi were greatly opposed to the Reciprocity Treaty because they feared that by giving America control of Puʻuloa, they would be losing a portion of their land and sovereignty. The Reciprocity Treaty was not very reciprocal because the U.S. exported much more goods to Hawaiʻi, then Hawaiʻi exported back. Additionally, American imports meant more to Hawaiʻi, then Hawaiian exports meant to America. To read a transcription of the treaty, see: http://www.hawaii-nation.org/treaty1875.html.

[5] Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom, vol. 2, 1854-1874, Twenty Critical Years*, 127. Lota Kapuāiwa said that, 'the prerogatives of the Crown out to be more carefully protected…and that the influence of the Crown ought to be seen pervading every function of the government.'

[6] Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom, vol. 2, 1854-1874, Twenty Critical Years*, 133. Kuykendall summarized the important changes: "The office of *kuhina-nui* was abolished, and the powers of the privy council were greatly curtailed; but the powers and prerogatives of the king were much increased, and the position of the cabinet as an administrative body was strengthened. As a consequence, the king and cabinet became the dominent element in the goverment. It was provided that the nobles and the representitves of the people should sit together in one chamber and be known collectively as the legislative assembly, thus putting an effective curb on the independent action of the house of representatives".

[7] "William Root Bliss," *New York Tribune,* (New York), April 10, 1906.

1872.[8] In 1873, Bliss' account of Hawai'i was published as a book titled *Paradise in the Pacific: A Book of Travel, Adventure, and Facts in the Sandwich Islands.* William Root Bliss described his book as "small; but so is [Hawai'i] and so are the people of which it treats, while [the book] is really larger than the importance of that country to any possible future of commerce or civilization."[9] Bliss argued that the American belief in Hawai'i's political and geographical importance was overrated; Hawai'i was too far away from the major shipping lanes of the Pacific. He concluded that Hawai'i was merely a place of leisure and escape, truly a "paradise in the Pacific."[10]

In the chapter, "The Hawaiian Kings", Bliss was vehemently critical of the Kamehameha dynasty, calling it a "polluted stream" and a "dynastic comedy".[11] According to Bliss, Kamehameha I was a "lustful savage", and was "literally, the father of his subjects. His hut was the harem of Hawaii." He also wrote that Kamehameha was regarded as a statesman, however Bliss claimed that during Kamehameha's life, the art of statesmanship was not known by the "barbarians" of the Pacific. Bliss was discontent with the comparisons between Kamehameha and conquerors such as Alexander of Macedon or Napoleon Bonaparte, in which he stated that these were the thoughts of "rosy historians".[12] Bliss thought of Kamehameha as inferior to these European figures.

As for Liholiho (Kamehameha II), Bliss referred to him as the son of one of Kamehameha's "concubines" (Ke'ōpūolani). Bliss provided his own uninformed version of the relationship between Liholiho and Ka'ahumanu. He speculated that Liholiho desired the 'ai noa and that Ka'ahumanu was the usurper of Liholiho's power; for this reason, Liholiho sailed to England in 1823 because he was "disgusted" at Ka'ahumanu.[13] However, Liholiho's trip to London was not out of disgust; he sought to learn more about the British government and political system, as well as to establish alliances with the British monarchy.[14] Bliss' framing of Liholiho's trip as a spontaneous venture undermined the calculated diplomatic decisions of

---

[8] *Boston Athenaeum*. Website. Accessed December 14, 2015. https://www.bostonathenaeum.org/about/ publications/ selections-acquired-tastes/william-root-bliss-1869-red-tan-shell-cameo-relief-augustus-saint-gaudens
[9] William Root Bliss, *Paradise in the Pacific*, (New York: Sheldon and Company, 1873), 5.
[10] Bliss, 5-7. Bliss hoped, "the book may be useful to those who journey thither, as well as interesting to that larger number of travelers who must always remain at home, and look at foreign scenes through another's eyes."
[11] Bliss, 43, 45.
[12] Bliss, 43-44.
[13] Bliss, 46.
[14] Kamanamaikalani Beamer, *No Mākou Ka Mana: Liberating the Nation*, (Honolulu: Kamehameha Publishing, 2014), 89.

Liholiho and the Hawaiian Kingdom. Additionally, Bliss described Kauikeaouli, Liholiho's brother and successor, as yet "another son of the libidinous chief." As for Kauikeaouli's wife, Kalama, Bliss employed hyperbole, writing that she had "survived him, squatting on a mat, eating with her fingers, sleeping on the floor, and wearing a few clothes, until 1871; when she died, and was buried with heathenish customs."[15] Bliss' assaults (and lies) against the ali'i was an attempt at discrediting their authority and to discredit the legitimacy of the Kingdom.

In a chapter titled, "Moral Life of the Natives", Bliss contrasted the lives of the Kānaka population against the haole population of Hawai'i. He believed that the missionary project had not been entirely successful in "eradicating" traditional Hawaiian religious and cultural traditions; which Bliss referred to as "superstitions".[16] He warned potential visitors that Kānaka, "like all Polynesians, are prone to theft."[17] Bliss had never traveled to another Pacific locale but drew upon pre-existing stereotypes of Pacific Islanders. In the case of disease, Bliss theorized that the susceptibility of Kānaka was the consequence for their supposed moral corruptness; disease was caused by "original sin; the iniquity of the parents visited upon the children, even to the third and fourth generation."[18] The use of the phrase "original sin" reveals Bliss' narrative as being shaped by Christianity.

Bliss had a contradicting view on gender, race, and morality in the context of Native Hawaiian women. He explicitly stated, "There is some beauty in the women of mixed blood, but none in the native women, if the first element of beauty is cleanliness."[19] In this context, the word "cleanliness" meant morality, Christian values to be specific. Bliss also noted that interracial marriages between white males and Native Hawaiian females were quite common, however, marriage between white females and Native Hawaiian males were rare.[20] Although Bliss regarded miscegenation as an "unnatural alliance between a superior and an inferior race"[21]; in a latter section he explained that a white man who married the "right kind of a native

[15] Bliss, 48.
[16] Bliss, 70-74.
[17] Bliss, 74-75.
[18] Bliss, 76.
[19] Bliss, 89.
[20] Bliss, 91. This is reflective of the racial politics of miscegenation in the United States at the time. White men could have a non-white wife or mistress. On the other hand, non-white men were a threat to white womanhood.
[21] Bliss, 91. This same tactic was used in North America, as European men took advantage of Native American tribes who practiced matrilineal descent in order to gain access to land, see: Susan Sleeper-Smith, *Indian Women and French Men: Rethinking Cultural Encounter in the Western Great Lakes*, (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001).

woman" (an aliʻi) would be a "candidate for public honors and perquisites."[22] By marrying into an aliʻi lineage, a Euro-American man could access land and wealth through his native wife, thus elevating his socio-economic status. In Bliss' view, the worth of Native Hawaiian women was the wealth and power that they brought to the marriage. Thus, the female body could be possessed and exploited for financial and political gain by male settlers.[23]

In regards to the possibility of Kānaka ʻŌiwi extinction, Bliss asked, "But what is to be the fate of the native islanders, over whom this surf of civilization is rolling? Are they to be swept away, like the American Indians, and give place to another race? They have been dying fast since they first saw the white man."[24] This question was followed by census data illustrating the decline of the native Hawaiian (lowercase n) population over the previous decades. He supported this narrative with his own observations; "Settlements are vanishing; cottages are vacated and destroyed; and we ride for miles in parts of the country which were once populous, without seeing a new hut, or hearing the voices of children, or meeting a human being."[25] This narrative created the imagining of empty, uninhabited landscape; an enticing image to someone who was thinking of settling and farming in Hawaiʻi. Bliss' reading of the landscape is an image that creates desire. As a foreigner, he could only imagine what things were "supposed" to look like. He could have been riding through spaces that had never been built upon.

It is clear that Bliss viewed Honolulu as an increasingly developed metropolitan city due to infrastructure and the small, but slowly growing white population. Bliss complimented the growth of public infrastructure during Lota Kapuāiwa's reign in the additions of the post office, Aliʻiōlani Hale, the Hawaiian Hotel, harbor lighthouse, and wharves. The growth of modern infrastructure provided visitors with comfort and familiarity. Throughout his writing, he often reminded the reader of the American presence, and that many Euro-Americans held prominent positions within society and in the government. He contributed this rise to power to the arrival of the ABCFM missionaries in 1820. He hypothesized that if the effects of American Christians were to be "withdrawn" then "the islanders would gradually relapse toward their original condition; and, as they are dying faster than they are born, *the islands must eventually become a*

[22] Bliss, 165.
[23] For more about marriages between haole men and Native Hawaiian women in regards to land, see: Jonathan K. Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887*, (Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press, 2002), 57-59.
[24] Bliss, 56.
[25] Bliss, 57.

legacy to the inhabitants of white blood."[26] To Bliss, Kānaka ʻŌiwi were going to die off, whether they progressed or "relapsed"; their impending extinction meant that Hawaiʻi was to be inherited by Euro-American settlers.

In the chapter, "The Hawaiian Civilization", Bliss posed two questions to his readers; first, he asked, "What does the Hawaiian civilization amount to?" To which he announced:

> There is an abundance of documentary civilization here. There is a constitution written in English, which the kingdom has presented as *its card of admission to the civilized society of the world*. There is a throne surrounded by *white* ministers. There are laws made by *white* people; courts with *white* judges and *white* attorneys. There are church organizations under *Anglo-Saxon* management. There is also a Hawaiian evangelical association…And even this organization is *Anglo-Saxon*…But all these forms of civilization are exotic. They belong to the *white* people alone. *With them, the mass of the Hawaiians have little or nothing to do*.[27]

Bliss thought of Hawaiʻi as a society improved by and ruled by whites, whereas Native Hawaiians were non-contributing members to this society. He tried to legitimize a Euro-American claim as Hawaiʻi's inheritors. This is seen earlier in his rant against the Kamehameha dynasty. Next, Bliss posed his second question, "What, then, is the Hawaiian civilization?":

> Is it any thing better than a condensation of animal aims and instincts? Is it any thing more than rum and opium and awa, lawfully drunk? and superstition and sloth lawfully tolerated; increasing crime as the population decreases? Is it any thing else than the means by which a colony of white people, who have sworn allegiance, and are paying adulation, to a barbaric throne, may support themselves out of taxes imposed upon the islanders?[28]

Finally, to answer his own question of whether Kānaka were actually civilized, Bliss exclaimed, "No! The Hawaiians, as a people, have not yet risen above heathenism. The white people are the only civilized people in the Hawaiian kingdom."[29] Bliss constantly expressed his belief that Native Hawaiians were worthless and expendable, creating a binary between "inferior" natives and "superior" foreigners.

---

[26] Bliss, 64. Italicization my own.
[27] Bliss, 158. Italicization my own.
[28] Bliss, 159.
[29] Bliss, 160.

While Bliss promoted Hawai‘i as a place primarily for Euro-American leisure, he frowned upon what he considered to be the “laziness” of Native Hawaiians. He regarded them as people without concern for time; living “in the present, taking little thought of the morrow; retaining many of the moral obliquities that the races of Polynesia have always possessed”; and that “most of them appear to me to be natural sluggards, who would rather lie on their bellies, and play cards all day, than stand upon their feet, and earn a livelihood.”[30] This was just the beginning of Bliss’ rant against “laziness”.

In another section, Bliss described a scene about political candidates campaigning for the upcoming election. According to Bliss, the primary issue for Kānaka was their concern over paying too many taxes. Kānaka wanted a candidate who would lessen or lift existing taxes; to which Bliss condescendingly responded, “Laziness favors free living.”[31] He regurgitated his stereotype of Hawaiian “laziness”:

> Here is indolence all around us. It is exemplified by those native men and women, lounging in scanty raiments on the grass, playing cards, and talking idle tattle, all day long. What specimens of human grossness and laziness! Even a silver coin is slow to induce a native boy to climb a cocoanut-tree, and throw down some nuts for us.[32]

In this amusing anecdote, Bliss assumed that the irresistible offer of money would “induce” this boy to immediately respond to the travelers’ request. Obviously, the boy thought differently; why should he obey the commands of a strange haole man? Bliss interpreted this incident as yet another example of “laziness”, however, this anecdote is really an example of Bliss’ presumption of authority as a Euro-American male and his expectation of Native Hawaiian hospitality.

Bliss’ construction of “laziness” is based on his observations of Kānaka engaging in leisurely activities. Yet when he discussed the labor economy, he commented that, “the Hawaiian who has simple food and shelter is not eager to work for [anything] more.”[33] If Kānaka were able to cultivate food and provide shelter for their families, then that was deemed work in itself. Scholar Mary Louis Pratt stated that in travel writing, “The maximizing, extractive paradigm of capitalism is presupposed, making a mystery of subsistence and non-accumulative lifeways.”[34]

---

[30] Bliss, 79-80.
[31] Bliss, 126. These were taxes for dogs, horses, roads, schools, poll, etc.
[32] Bliss, 201.
[33] Bliss, 59.
[34] Pratt, 151.

Bliss did not see subsistence practices such as farming, fishing, or gathering as "work" because it could not be quantified in the haole capitalist system, in which labor performed over a certain period of time is exchanged for money. Historian Christine Skwiot further argued, "The privileged, white nineteenth-century U.S. citizens who came to regard vacations as social and cultural entitlements and mental and physical health requirements continued to view leisure and idleness as 'sources of moral, spiritual, financial, and political danger." [35] This was yet another contradiction posed by travel writing and travelers such as Bliss. Bliss labeled Native Hawaiians who did not have "real" jobs or refused to be taxed, as lazy and burdensome on the government, thus, a burden on the Euro-American population.

Bliss' *Paradise in the Pacific* was overwhelmingly critical of all Kānaka, from the so-called "polluted" ali'i to the "lazy" commoners. The fate of these "uncivilized" peoples was death; subsequently and conveniently the "legacy" of Hawai'i rested in the hands of Euro-Americans. Like the land, Bliss thought that Native Hawaiian women could be controlled and exploited for personal advancement by Euro-American settlers. Bliss credited progress to the work of the American mission and growing Euro-American population. Although Bliss was skeptical about Hawai'i's economic future, his construction of the "Imagined Hawai'i" was a paradise for haole leisure.

The Hawaiian Archipelago: Six Months Among the Palm Groves, Coral Reefs, and Volcanoes of the Sandwich Islands by Isabella Bird (1875)

Isabella Bird was already a world famous explorer when she arrived in Hawai'i in 1873. She had traveled through North America, Japan, the Malay Peninsula, Persia, Kurdistan, Korea and China. Bird was the very first woman inducted into the Royal Geographic Society of Britain.[36] She chronicled her trip to Hawai'i through a series of letters written to her sister; these letters were then published as *The Hawaiian Archipelago* in 1875. Due to Bird's notoriety, her book gained popularity and was re-printed/re-issued in 1876, 1880, 1890, 1894, and 1906. The

[35] Christine Skwiot, *The Purposes of Paradise: U.S. Tourism and Empire in Cuba and Hawai'i*, (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), 9.
[36] Korte, 110.

publication also included excerpts from other writers who had previously written about Hawai‘i such as J. Jackson Jarves, missionary Rev. William Ellis, and geologist W. T. Brigham.[37]

Bird stayed in Hawai‘i from January to August, 1873, visiting O‘ahu, Kaua‘i, Maui, and Hawai‘i Island. Bird seemed to enjoy Hawai‘i Island the most; she made two trips, which combined for almost four months. On Hawai‘i Island, she spent most of her time traversing the rugged Hāmākua Coast on foot and horseback. This she did with both haole and Native Hawaiian companions. Bird's experiences in Hawai‘i were more complex than that of Bliss or Moseley due to three reasons: Bird's eagerness to explore and interact with all types of people, her positionality as a white Christian woman, and as previously mentioned, her lengthy stay. This complexity heavily affected the way she viewed Kānaka ‘Ōiwi as well as how she saw her own positionality. By the end of her travel, it is clear that she had been changed by her experiences, even if only a little.

During her stay on Hawai‘i Island, Bird literally came face to face with the Kingdom-wide leprosy outbreak. In fact, two Kānaka that Bird had become acquainted with contracted leprosy and were sent to Kalawao on the Makanalua Peninsula of Moloka‘i. The first was Bird's guide Upa, who she greatly respected; Upa had impressed her with his knowledge of Queen Victoria, the history of European wars, and the Pope.[38] When Upa was taken, Bird was saddened and acknowledged his "joyous nature", as well as his family that he had to leave behind.[39]

The second Kanaka was William "Bill" Ragsdale, a lawyer and an interpreter for the Kingdom's Legislature. He was well respected throughout the islands, especially in his hometown of Hilo.[40] The news of Ragsdale's diagnosis shocked the community. On the day he was sent off, both Kānaka and haole honored Ragsdale; they gave him multitudes of lei and well wishes. Bird witnessed firsthand the meaning of "ma‘i ho‘oka‘awale ‘ohana" (the disease that separates family) as she described the sounds of wailing and crying from relatives and friends in mourning who had to watch their loved ones sail away.[41] Ragsdale's political life did not end in

---

[37] Isabella Bird, *The Hawaiian Archipelago*, (London: John Murray, 1875), 5. These three texts are: *History of the Hawaiian or Sandwich Islands: Embracing Their Antiquities, Mythology, Legends, Discovery by Europeans in the Sixteenth Century, Re-Discovery by Cook, with Their Civil, Religious and Political History, from the Earliest Traditionary Period to the Present Time* (1843) by James Jackson Jarves, *A Journal of a Tour Round Hawaii, the largest of the Sandwich Islands* (1823) by William Ellis, and *The Hawaiian Volcanoes* by W. T. Brigham.
[38] Bird, 69, 70, 94.
[39] Bird, 215.
[40] Rev. B. Bausman, editor, "A Leper Governor Gone," in *The Guardian*, vol 23, (Philadelphia: The Reformed Church Publication Board, 1877), 242.
[41] Bird, 364-365.

his exile to Kalawao; when he arrived, his reputation earned him the respect of the patients there and he became known as the "Governor". Ragsdale's professional experience allowed him to create better structure and organization for the Kalawao community until his death several years later.[42]

Although Bird acknowledged the government's effort in trying to 'stamp out' leprosy, she described Kalawao as "one of the most horrible spots on all the earth; a home of hideous disease and slow coming death, with which science in despair has ceased to grapple; a community of doomed beings, socially dead, whose only business is to perish."[43] In some regards, Bird's analysis was correct. At the time Bird was writing, the isolation policy had only been in place for less than ten years. The infrastructure and management system for patient care at Kalawao was severely under-developed and inadequate, resulting in an array of problems.[44]

Isabella Bird criticized the way Native Hawaiians handled the leprosy outbreak; blaming the spread of leprosy on their "leprous taint".[45] Bird was horrified that afflicted and non-afflicted Hawaiians shared smoking pipes and clothes. Many afflicted Kānaka tried to evade the isolation policy by hiding in the forest or in scarcely populated areas, or they were hidden by family members. Bird said all these people were being "ignorant."[46] While traveling the Hāmākua Coast, she slept in a house with Kānaka in Waimanu Valley, two of which she claimed were in "an advanced stage of leprosy". Bird worried:

> Everything favoured reflection, but I think the topics to which my mind most frequently reverted were my own absolute security—a lone white woman among 'savages,' and the civilizing influence which Christianity has exercised, so that even in this isolated valley, gouged out of a mountainous coast, there was nothing disagreeable or improper to be seen.[47]

Here is the first example of Bird's acknowledgement of her white Christian womanhood. She believed that as a white woman, she should have feared these possibly afflicted Kānaka;

---

[42] Bird, 372-373. In the article "Ike Wale Ke Kilauea Ia Molokai", the writer explained that the people supported Ragsdale like they would support an ali'i. When Ragsdale died, his body was taken and buried at the piko (center, core) of Moku 'Okala, an off-shore islet. This was to honor a man who was considered to be the "governor" of the settlement. "Ike Wale Ke Kilauea Ia Molokai," *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, (Honolulu: Hawai'i, 10 August 1922).
[43] Bird, 370, 377. Isabella Bird's account of the peninsula is based on government reports and first hand accounts from others. In my research, I have yet to locate an account of a traveler actually entering into the settlement.
[44] Inglis, 171-172. The situation at the settlement would improve over the years.
[45] Bird, 251.
[46] Bird, 251.
[47] Bird, 244.

however, she believed that Christianity had pacified the "savages". This scene displayed the "Imaginary Hawai'i" as exotic, yet somewhat safe.

Christianity served as basis for Bird's definition of "civilized"; Kānaka who were not Christian and did not follow Christian values were uncivilized.[48] She also emphasized the dichotomy between the "ancient" (pre-1820) and the "modern" (post-1820). Anything she regarded as a remnant of the ancient (clothing style, tattoo, mele, hula) was un-civil and heathenish; as in the examples of an "old woman in a red sack, much tattooed" and "a lean hideous old man, dressed only in a malo."[49] At the house of a man named Bolabola in Hāmākua, Bird observed:

> A frightful old woman, looking like a relic of the old heathen days, with bristling grey hair cut short, her body tattooed all over, and no clothing but a ragged blanket huddled round her shoulders; a girl about twelve, with torrents of shining hair, and a piece of bright green calico thrown round her, and two very good-looking young women in rose-coloured chemises, one of them holding a baby, were squatting and lying on the mats, one over another, like a heap of savages."[50]

At night, these women, "with low sensual faces, like some low order of animal", took turns eating from a large bowl of poi with "animal satisfaction."[51] To Bird, these Kānaka were so primal that they ceased to be humans; they were remnants of the uncivilized past. Although Bird does not explicitly mention gender, she definitely saw the behavior and characteristics of these Hawaiian women as un-ladylike in the context of the Victorian Era.

Another example of Bird's construction of the "uncivilized" Kānaka is in her account of Lunalilo's visit to Hilo. Lunalilo had recently been elected as mō'ī and he made his necessary tour through the islands.[52] People (Kānaka, Chinese, Euro-American) from all over east Hawai'i

---

[48] Bird described "civilized" Native Hawaiians, generally speaking, as a "quiet, courteous, orderly, harmless, Christian community." Bird, 5. Additionally, she had endless praise for the missionary work of Rev. Titus Coan of Hilo; "one of the first and most successful missionaries to Hawaii, also called. He is a tall, majestic-looking man, physically well fitted for the extraordinary exertions he has undergone in mission work, and intellectually also, I should think, for his face expresses great mental strength, and nothing of the weakness of a sanguine enthusiast." Bird, 68.

[49] Bird, 72.

[50] Bird, 141.

[51] Bird, 142

[52] I elaborate on the political necessity of the ali'i tour in Chapter 4. Isabella Bird had the opportunity to meet Lunalilo and was impressed by his knowledge and intelligence. He conversed with Bird on the subject of the English monarchy and government. According to Bird, Lunalilo said that perhaps the Hawaiian Kingdom copied too much

Island flocked into Hilo to pay their respects to Lunalilo and to deliver hoʻokupu (offerings or gifts) of lei, food, money, etc. It was as if the whole town of Hilo had stopped just for this occasion. After the long procession of hoʻokupu, Lunalilo rested in front of the Hilo courthouse. As he was resting, Bird described:

> two ancient and hideous females, who looked like heathen priestesses, chanted a monotonous and heathenish-sounding chant or *mele*, in eulogy of some ancient idolater. It just served to remind me that this attractive crowd was but one generation removed from slaughter-loving gods and human sacrifices.[53]

Here Bird saw the two women as uncivilized because of their appearance and their performance of mele. Bird cannot appreciate the mele because she does not understand it; she could only see the aesthetic of the performance, which did not align with her own concept. She also admitted that despite being an "attractive crowd", Kānaka were tainted with the history of their past, as if savagery was a genetically inherited trait.

The last target of Bird's criticism was the Native Hawaiian family. Bird accused Kānaka women of pursuing "pleasure" over "maternal instinct". She thought these women had poor maternal skills because they practiced hānai; she only understood family as the immediate nucleus, rather than including extended relatives and family friends.[54] In the Victorian era, the strong matronly figure ruled the family; the matron's responsibility was to regulate the domestic sphere, and most importantly, care for her own children.[55] Bird claimed to know how Native Hawaiian families and communities should be structured and controlled.

How was a civilized Kānaka woman supposed to behave? According to Bird, the future of Native Hawaiian women rested in attaining a "higher morality" by emulating their British and American counterparts. This she found at the Lāhaina (Maui) girls school, which housed and

---

from British monarchy, and wanted to "abolish a good many high sounding titles, sinecure offices, the household troops, and some of the 'imitation pomp' of his court." Bird, 210-211.

[53] Bird, 206-207.

[54] Bird, 318. Hānai is a Hawaiian practice of communal rearing. The word "hānai" means to raise, rear, or feed. A child belonging to one family could be raised by another family, for a number of circumstances. Hānai also allowed for intergenerational teaching and training, such as a relationship between grandparent and grandchild. Sometimes the child would return to his/her birth parents at a later age. Hānai took place in both aliʻi and makaʻāinana families. It is not equivalent to the Western ideology of adoption. Also see: Mary Kawena Pukui, Haertig, Lee, Nānā I Ke Kumu (Look to the Source) Volume II, Honolulu: Hui Hānai, 2002), 36.

[55] Bridget Orr, "'Stifling Pity in a Parent's Breast: Infanticide and Savagery in Late Eighteenth-century Travel Writing," in *Travel Writing and Empire: Postcolonial Theory in Transit*. Edited by Steve Clark. (New York: Zed Books, 1999), 133.

educated young Hawaiian women.[56] Bird thought that the girls' removal from the "negative" influences of Hawaiian life would help them develop and foster "industrious and housewifely habits, and the raising [of] them in their occupations and amusements *above* those which are natural to their race."[57]

Bird's epitome of the "civilized" Hawaiian woman was Queen Emma Kaleleonālani Rooke, the wife of the late Mōʻī Alexander Liholiho. Queen Emma was "pretty", "graceful", and "refined by education and circumstances."[58] However, it is evident that Bird's views were biased because of Emma's relationship to Bird's home country of England. Emma was part English through her maternal grandfather, ʻOlohana (John Young).[59] In her youth, she was raised (through hānai) by her aunt Kamaʻikuʻi and aunt's husband Englishman Dr. Thomas Rooke. Emma was a strong supporter of the Anglican Church (Church of England) and the British Honolulu Mission.[60] Bird saw her as an ideal example of civility, and a true Victorian woman.

Surprisingly Bird criticized the British Honolulu Mission in *The Hawaiian Archipelago*. She believed that because Kānaka were already on the path to salvation by way of the American mission, there was no need introduce another type of Christianity because it would only confuse and further divide Kānaka.[61] As one could imagine, the British Church was not very happy with Bird's criticism. In the prefatory note of the 1876 version of *The Hawaiian Archipelago*, Bird apologized and explained that she had removed the words of criticism from that version because of the negative response of the Church.

Aliʻi such as Lunalilo and Emma were important in Bird's vision of a progressing Hawaiʻi. At the end of her letters, Bird wrote a chapter on Hawaiian history, where she expounded on her views of the development from savagery to civility. Once again, Bird assigned savagery to the reign of Kamehameha I (pre-1820), while civilization developed under

---

[56] Bird, 252. The Lāhaina school housed "thirty-seven boarders, native and half native, and mixed native and Chinese, between the ages of four and eighteeen." They were given an "English education" and training in "housewifely arts...modest dress and deportment, and propriety in language."
[57] Bird, 255. Italicization my own.
[58] Bird, 262.
[59] John Young is known as one of Kamehameha I's most trusted advisors. Young, an Englishmen, was a seaman aboard Simon Metcalf's *Eleanora*. Due to his success as an advisor, Kamehameha awarded him with land at Kawaihae, Hawaiʻi Island. Additionally, Young was able to marry into an aliʻi line; he is the grandfather of Queen Emma.
[60] Bird, 262.
[61] Bird, 437.

Kauikeaouli (Kamehameha III).[62] She saw this progression as the product of two factors: religion and government (constitutional monarchy). Of course, Bird praised the American missionaries for bringing enlightenment and civility to the Kingdom and its subjects:

> The missionaries translated the Bible and other books into Hawaiian, taught the natives to read and write, gave the princes and nobles a high class education, induced the king and chiefs to renounce their oppressive feudal rights, with legal advice framed a constitution which became the law of the land, and obtained the recognition of the little Polynesian kingdom as a member of the brotherhood of civilized nations.[63]

Like Bliss, Bird rendered the Hawaiian Kingdom as a product of Euro-American effort and ingenuity. Interestingly, she actually weighed the positive and negative consequences of the haole presence in the Islands. The negative, the "slow but infallible destruction" of Kānaka; the positive, "the knowledge of the life that is to come."[64]

Bird thought of Hawai'i as a suitable location for white settlers. The Hawaiian government was "one of the best administered" and "wrong and oppression are unknown."[65] Settlers could live "simply", with a Chinese cook and a Hawaiian nurse. Bird exclaimed that white women looked "truly graceful and refined" in their "domestic duties."[66] As for the haole men, they "don't seem to have near so much occupation as the ladies"; they hung out by the courthouse (playing croquet on the lawn) or at the stores, gossiping about women.[67] Here Bird painted a picture that was strikingly different than how William Root Bliss felt about work and leisure. Whereas Bliss was so concerned about work and Kānaka laziness, in Bird's view, white women worked harder than the seemingly lazy white men.

Bird assured that white women and white men did not have worry about what Bird called "burglarious instincts". She did not say who the "burgularious instincts" might belong too, but she was most likely referring to Native Hawaiians. This is in stark contrast to Bliss' generalization that all Kānaka were prone to theft. Haole settlers could leave their house doors

[62] Bird, 465.
[63] Bird, 5.
[64] Bird, 267.
[65] Bird, 104.
[66] Bird, 99.
[67] Bird, 100.

unlocked, and Bird guaranteed that the "person and property of a white man are everywhere secure, and a white woman is sure of unvarying respect and kindness."[68]

Progress was also situated in possible American annexation. At this time, there were early talks of annexation because sugar planters were struggling with the American trade taxes (Reciprocity had not happened yet). Bird, from her "British point of view", supported the Kānaka ʻŌiwi position against American annexation; but she ultimately believed that "annexation…is the 'manifest destiny' of the islands…but it is impious and impolitic to hasten it." She wrote that the more "thoughtful natives" had accepted this fate, and that the "less intelligent" were becoming "restive and irritable."[69] With the possibility of future annexation, white settlers would feel even more secure and willing to migrate to an American colony.

As previously stated, Bird's eagerness to explore and interact with all types of people, her position as a white Christian woman, and her lengthy stay allowed for more complex experiences than other travelers. By the end of her account, Bird's attitude towards Native Hawaiians and their culture is a bit more nuanced. She showed more acceptance and adaptation towards Hawaiian customs, some of which she had initially criticized. At the beginning of her journey, the poi-eating women of Waimanu Valley disgusted Bird; however, by the end of *The Hawaiian Archipelago*, she took pride in eating poi with her fingers while sitting on lauhala mats. Her lengthy stay also allowed her to establish a basic understanding of Hawaiian language; where she admitted, "for some time I have not spoken any but Hawaiian words."[70] Bird changed her clothing to fit in with Native Hawaiian women as well. Initially, she was impartial to the holokū that they wore, but later, she came to embrace the clothing style.[71] She described the holokū wearing women as "majestic *wahine*", in comparison to the "diminutive, fair-skinned haole" who were "grotesque".[72] Bird's harsh words towards the white women of Hawai'i were unexpected.

---

[68] Bird, 440-441.

[69] Bird, 280. She explained, "Much as I like America, I shrink from the day when her universal political corruption and her unrivalled political immorality shall be naturalized on Hawaii nei." Of course, as a British citizen, she would not endorse an American expansion.

[70] Bird, 428.

[71] A holokū is "a loose, seamed dress with a yoke and usually with a train, patterned after the Mother Hubbards of the missionaries." Mary Kawena Pukui and Samuel H. Elbert, *Hawaiian Dictionary,* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1986), 78.

[72] Bird, 274-275. Bird commented, "At first the *holuku* [sic], which is only a full, yoke nightgown, is not attractive, but I admire it heartily now, and the sagacity of those who devised it. It conceals awkwardness, and befits grace of movement; it is fit for the climate, is equally adapted for walking and riding, and has the general appropriateness which is desirable in costuem. The women have a most peculiar walk, with a swinging motion from the hip at each step, in which the shoulder sympathises. I never saw anything at all like it...and I should know a Hawaiian woman

Bird experienced an increased awareness of the differences between European and Native Hawaiian womanhood. While traversing the treacherous Hāmākua terrain, Bird and her Kānaka traveling companions came across a steep dyke, and she realized that none of the men had offered to help her climb. If she had been traveling with Euro-Americans, it would have been expected that a male offer to help her. However, Bird was not particularly surprised that the Hawaiian men did not help her because "the native women never need help, as they are as strong, fearless, and active as the men, and rival them in swimming and other athletic sports."[73] Bird was envious of Native Hawaiian women's ability to freely (and skillfully) engage in various types of physical activity, which would have been scorned in Victorian British society.

In *Venturesome Women*, Precious McKenzie-Stearns stated that Bird was able to 'go native' by the means of horseback riding. It was not just the act of riding a horse; it was the style in which Bird used. In the Victorian Era it was considered "unladylike" to ride a horse astride (straddled), instead women rode sidesaddle with both legs on one side of the horse's body. Riding sidesaddle was extremely uncomfortable, especially for an eager explorer like Bird. At one point in her journey, Bird decided to switch to the much more comfortable (and safer) position of riding astride.[74] McKenzie-Stearns argued that by riding astride, Bird "seizes power and authority for her narrative as she proves she is able to perform the same physical activities that a man might."[75]

Although Bird's profession as an explorer already freed her from the matronly responsibilities of the European domestic sphere; her experiences with both Native Hawaiian women and men must have been an incredible liberation from Victorian Era gender roles. Yet a contradiction exists, Bird could play "Hawaiian" while simultaneously suggesting that actual Native Hawaiian women needed to be domesticated for their own sake. This echoes William Root Bliss' promotion of Hawai'i as a place of leisure while criticizing Native Hawaiians for being "lazy". The "Imagined Hawai'i" was a place reserved for the enjoyment of white foreigners; they could "do what the natives do" while chastising Kānaka for exhibiting the same behavior.

---

by it in any part of the world." The freedom of movement provided by the holokū is perhaps a metaphor for Bird's own liberation.

[73] Bird, 238.

[74] McKenzie-Stearns, 31.

[75] McKenzie-Stearns, 32.

The narratives of extinction, civility, and progress are threaded throughout *The Hawaiian Archipelago*. Despite Bird's sympathy for the leprosy patients, she blamed Kānaka for spreading the disease and causing their own decline. She defined "civilized" Kānaka as those who had fully accepted Christianity and practiced Christian-like behavior, while those who dressed or practiced "ancient" culture were still heathens and savages. Yet, she reminded readers that even "civilized" Hawaiians were descended from "uncivil" ancestors. Despite her admiration for the freedom and strength of Hawaiian women, she prescribed a domesticity that she personally found stifling as the answer for young Hawaiian women. Because Hawai'i was generally "civilized", white settler families could prosper and be secure without the threat of violence. Although unlike William Root Bliss, Isabella Bird had acquired a certain measure of respect for Native Hawaiians.

Notes by a Naturalist on the Challenger 1872-1876 by Henry Nottidge "H. N." Moseley (1979)

The British *Challenger* expedition was dispatched between 1872-1876; it is one of the most famous scientific quests in world history. Aboard the HMS *Challenger* were civilian scientists (along with a full sailing crew), one of which was naturalist Henry Nottidge "H. N." Moseley. In the words of Moseley, the purpose of the expedition "was to investigate scientifically the physical conditions and natural history of the deep sea all over the world."[76] The HMS *Challenger* expedition visited O'ahu and Hawai'i Island from July 27th to August 19th, 1875, between its voyage from Japan to Tahiti. *Notes by a Naturalist* is compilation of the notes Moseley wrote during the entire expedition. Moseley's writing reflects his role as a scientific traveler; he focused primarily on describing flora and fauna rather than providing a copious amount of social or political commentary. Additionally, almost half of his notes about Hawai'i are descriptions about various types of Hawaiian woodcarvings, especially those that depicted deity.

Like Bliss, Moseley commented on the growing Euro-American community in Honolulu. He noted that, "Honolulu has a thoroughly *American* aspect. *Americans* are supplanting the rapidly decreasing native population; *American* plants are, as has been said, covering the ground, and *American* birds have been introduced."[77] Whether it was humans or flora or fauna, the native

[76] H. N. Moseley, *Notes by A Naturalist on the "Challenger"*, (London: Macmillan and Co, 1879), 1.
[77] Moseley, 496.

was replaced by the alien species. Following this observation, Moseley wrote that the Chinese population was the only competitor to the Americans "in the struggle for existence."[78] It was as if Kānaka were non-existent, or a non-factor because they were believed to be on a path to extinction.

The narrative of extinction was evident in Moseley's collection of artifacts. He wrote that he ventured to the estate of John Cummins (a Native Hawaiian) in Waimānalo, and took Hawaiian skulls from an old mass burial site.[79] Moseley exclaimed, "I know of no place where so abundant material is ready at hand for the study of the skeletal peculiarities of a savage race, by the examination of long series of crania and skeletons, as here."[80] Here, Moseley possessed physical evidence to support his idea that Native Hawaiians were indeed a dying race; therefore, the value of Kānaka ʻŌiwi was only as objects of scientific observation.

One highlight of Moseley's account was Kalākaua's visit aboard the *Challenger*. Moseley described the crew's greeting of the mōʻī:

> The officers of the ship, donned, as in duty bound, full 'war paint' to receive him, and even one member of the scientific staff appeared in curious clothes, and was girt with a rudimentary sword for the occasion, yet the Polynesian king arrived in a black frock coat, white waistcoat, and straw hat. To a confirmed 'agriologist' the tables seemed completely turned on European civilization.[81]

Agriology is a 19th century term that refers to the "the comparative study of the customs of non-literate people"; which basically referred to the indigenous and non-Anglo peoples and cultures that Western scientists thought of as savage.[82] Because Moseley assumed Native Hawaiians to be savages and uncivilized, he did not anticipate Kalākaua's Western-style attire, hence the turning of the tables. Moseley was also surprised at Kalākaua's interest in the *Challenger* Expedition as

---

[78] Moseley, 497.

[79] John Cummins is John Adams "J. A." Kuakini Cummins (1835-1913), named after John Adams Kuakini, a former governor of Hawaiʻi Island and Oʻahu. J. A. Cummins' estate on the Waimānalo Coast was called Mauna Loke. His obituary described him as an important man who did important things for the aliʻi. In his childhood, Cummins was a playmate with the aliʻi children. His mother, Kaumakaokane, was a high ranking aliʻi, while his father, Thomas Cummins, was a British man. Cummins is most known for his political actions during the 1890s, in which he was arrested for supplying weapons. "Hala Ia Kamaaina a Kanaka Koʻi Koʻi o ka Aina," *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, (Honolulu: Hawaiʻi), March 28, 1913.

[80] Moseley, 498-499. In the case of Moseley, it is not clear if John Cummins even knew that Moseley had taken iwi because Moseley does not write anything about actually meeting Cummins in person.

[81] Moseley, 497-498. The phrase "full war paint" is probably referring to British military uniforms.

[82] Definition via Merriam-Webster.

well as his knowledge about a particular animal species.[83] Moseley's preconceived notions of the stereotypical "native" were challenged by Kalākaua's appearance, as well as his passion for science.

Although Moseley's notes on his time in Hawai'i are short in comparison to the writing of Bliss and Bird, his notes provide a sufficient example a scientific traveler's perspective. As a naturalist, Moseley's worldview was defined by observing, ordering, and categorizing the natural world. As discussed in the previous chapter, 19th century science and anthropology relied heavily on the construction of hierarchies. From the very beginning, Moseley's hierarchy is clear: British and Euro-Americans were superior to Native Hawaiians. American people, plants, and animals were encroaching upon Hawai'i; soon all things Hawaiian would be extinct (as evident by the collection of bones). For Moseley, this was an experiment of the "survival of the fittest", a concept that had recently entered the 19th century scientific realm.[84]

Like Bliss, Moseley saw the "Imagined Hawai'i" as the inheritance of white settlers (the superior species). Moseley's encounter with Kalākaua is critical because the mō'ī was an anomaly in Moseley's worldview. What did it mean if an apparently "inferior" king was dressed in Western attire and could carry on a meaningful conversation about science? The hierarchy is dismantled and the order is now in disorder. This dismantling is applicable to Bird's experience, whereas Bird realized that women in Hawaiian culture had a type of agency that she had greatly desired. "Anomalies" destabilize, if even momentarily, the ethno-centricity of these travelers' worldview and the dichotomy of superiority and inferiority.

The Hawaiian Guide Book by Henry M. Whitney (1875)

Henry Whitney (1824-1904), a second-generation missionary descendent, was a very prominent publisher in the Hawaiian Kingdom. At different points of his life, Whitney was responsible for publishing or editing newspapers such as *The Polynesian*, *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, *The Hawaiian Gazette* and the Hawaiian language newspaper *Ka Nūpepa Kū'oko'a* (The Independent).[85] In *The Hawaiian Guide Book*, Whitney incorporated the writing of Ellis,

[83] Moseley, 498.
[84] The phrase "survival of the fittest" originates from Herbert Spencer's *Principles of Biology* (1864). Spencer was a contemporary of Charles Darwin and Alfred Russel Wallace.
[85] In Whitney's second guide book *The Tourists' Guide* (1895), he included advertisments for the *Pacific Commerical Advertiser*, *Hawaiian Gazette*, *Ka Nūpepa Kū'oko'a*, and *The Planter's Monthly*, which were all critical of the monarchy.

Jarves, the aforementioned Isabella Bird, and traveler George Washington Bates.[86] 4,000 copies of Whitney's *Guide Book* were printed for purchase. Newspaper advertisements exclaimed that the guide book could be purchased and mailed to any address in the United States or Europe.[87]

In the first pages of the *Guide Book*, Whitney welcomed his readers to his imagination of Hawai'i, as a "Paradise and the Garden of Eden."[88] His prospective audience included: "Tourists in pursuit of health or the most delightful tropical climate and scenery: men of business as well as men of leisure."[89] Hawai'i was the traveler's tropical playground. Besides catering to visitors, Whitney aimed at persuading people to settle in Hawai'i. He included a section titled "Information for Immigrants", where he addressed any questions that a prospective settler would have about the Hawaiian government, taxes, climate, agriculture, economy, etc.[90] Any visitor or settler would be entranced by the "Anglo-Hawaiian city of Honolulu."[91] The American, English, and German populations of Hawai'i were examples of "good specimens of the restless race who penetrate to the ends of the earth."[92] Thus, the European or American traveler would feel comfortable in the familiar presence of his countrymen.

After highlighting the white population, Whitney praised Honolulu's improving infrastructure in his effort to promote Honolulu as an exotic, but Euro-American dominated, metropolitan city. An example of these great infrastructural accomplishments was the "first class" Hawaiian Hotel, which had opened in 1871.[93] He included listings for churches and

---

[86] Bates' publication was titled *Sandwich Island Notes by a Haole* (1854).
[87] "Just Published the Hawaiian Guide Book!," *Hawaiian Gazette*, (Honolulu, Hawai'i), February 2, 1876. There were three distributors of the *Guide Book*, in three different locations: Henry M. Whitney in Honolulu, White & Bauer in San Francisco, and Gordon & Botch in Sydney.
[88] Whitney, *The Hawaiian Guide Book*, 3.
[89] Whitney, *The Hawaiian Guide Book*, 13.
[90] Whitney, *The Hawaiian Guide Book*, 111, 119. Whitney also synthesized his answers into one paragraph: "our government is liberal—taxes are light—courts of law guarantee justice to foreigner and native alike—our climate is remarkable genial and healthful—life and property are secure—land is obtained at a fair price—labor and capital are in demand and well paid—and the staple products of the islands…are in demand at a fair profit to the producer…Those who are in search of a country where they can live cheaply, provided they dispense with luxuries, in a climate as fascinating as it is healthy, can find no place equal to the Hawaiian Islands."
[91] Whitney, *The Hawaiian Guide Book*, 14.
[92] Whitney, *The Hawaiian Guide Book*, 28.
[93] Whitney, *The Hawaiian Guide Book*, 7. Although "hotels" existed before 1871, the Hawaiian Hotel was more comparable to an average hotel of contemporary times. Previous to the Hawaiian Hotel, "hotels" were more like boarding houses. Travelers in Honolulu had access to these hotels. However, if a traveler went to outside of the city or to another island, they had to stay in the houses of either Kānaka or white families, as example in the travels of Isabella Bird. Whitney explained, "the natives will be found kind, hospitable and inoffensive, and as general rule honest, at least with those who confide in them. In almost every village there are white residents, but where there are none the natives will always provide for strangers lodging and food—such as they have, trusting to the generosity of their guests for their reward." Whitney, *The Hawaiian Guide Book*, 121.

organizational lodges so that visitors and settlers could find comfort in religion, as well as in social groups. Knowledge of the Hawaiian Kingdom's educational system would be very important to settling families. Whitney informed readers that there were 242 schools and 7,755 scholars in the Kingdom, available in both Hawaiian and English. At the core of Honolulu's infrastructure were its public institutions, which Whitney listed as the Insane Asylum, O'ahu Jail, the Queen's Hospital, Ali'iōlani Hale (the Parliament House), and the Reformatory School.[94] These public institutions represented the hallmarks of a "modern" nation.

The narrative of extinction worked hand in hand with Whitney's portrayal and desire to show the small but growing Euro-American community. He introduced the reader to the "mixed race" population of the Kingdom, those who were part Native Hawaiian and part haole, who were considered more "civilized" (such as Queen Emma). This population was "most important and rapidly increasing", and would become, "the masters of the land, as the natives are fast passing away."[95] In Whitney's construction, the "mixed race" population was biologically superior to native Hawaiians because they possessed white blood. One example was Thomas Martin, a judge from Waiohinu, Ka'ū, Hawai'i Island. Martin, as Whitney explained, was "a noble *specimen* of the half-caste race, dispenses the hospitalities of the place, and exhibits the advanced civilization of Hawaii most worthily."[96] Whitney used Martin as a token of what the future of Hawai'i could look like because Martin was a model Kānaka "specimen".

Like Isabella Bird, it is no surprise that Whitney, a missionary descendant, believed that Kānaka 'Ōiwi were more or less civilized because of the introduction of Christianity and literacy by the American mission in the first half of the 19th century. He exclaimed, "a Hawaiian who cannot, at least, read and write, is rarely to be found."[97] Although Whitney considered Kānaka to be civilized, he still exoticized them and made Kānaka objects of observation. In his description of a scene aboard the inter-island steamship *Kilauea*, he wrote that amongst the throngs of passengers, a traveler could partake in the "observation of Hawaiian home life—manners, habits, civilization, kind of dress, mode of rest, of retiring, of arising, of eating, drinking, caring for

[94] Whitney, *The Hawaiian Guide Book,* 19-22.
[95] Whitney, *The Hawaiian Guide Book*, 28. He also explained that "smallpox, measles, licentiousness, the changes from barbarism to civilization" contributed to the decline of Kānaka 'Ōiwi, thus, "the end cannot be far distant." Whitney, *The Hawaiian Guide Book*, 64.
[96] Whitney, *The Hawaiian Guide Book*, 96. Italicization my own.
[97] Whitney, *The Hawaiian Guide Book*, 22.

wife, children and family, the eating of poi with their fingers, which every one should see."[98] Despite being civilized, Whitney contended that Kānaka ʻŌiwi were "simple natives" that could be seen "strolling on the beach, fishing in the sea, or sporting in the surf."[99] It was as if Native Hawaiians were on display at a museum for the voyeuristic gaze of travelers. Unlike Bliss in *Paradise in the Pacific*, Whitney did not criticize Kānaka for their lifestyle, nor did he ever refer to them as lazy, they were just simple, or in Whitney's words, "not at all fastidious."[100] Non-fastidious, simple Native Hawaiians were just static objects in the backdrop of the "Imagined Hawaiʻi, leaving the foreground vacant for settlers to occupy.

As a whole, *The Hawaiian Guide Book* was truly centered on promoting Hawaiʻi as a place on par with any other modern nation. Whitney balanced the familiar and the exotic; the visitor or settler could live in a "civilized" Hawaiʻi but still observe the exotic Hawaiian "Other" (land and people). Whitney's "Imagined Hawaiʻi" was exactly what travelers were looking for in a destination; it was not the mundane European or American destination, yet it was not overrun with uncivilized savages. Unlike the more candid writings of Bliss, Bird, or Moseley, Whitney remained fairly reserved and neutral, staying clear of any serious criticisms. However, Whitney's 1895 guidebook *The Tourists' Guide* (Chapter 3) contained his strong dislike towards the monarchy and his support of American intervention.

Producing Paradise: Progress, Civility, and Extinction

The narrative themes concerning Kānaka ʻŌiwi are clear in these different publications. In *Paradise of the Pacific* William Root Bliss was extremely disparaging towards Native Hawaiians. He thought that Kānaka (aliʻi and commoner, female and male) were irresponsible and uncivil, and thoroughly believed that Native Hawaiians would quickly become extinct. Bliss celebrated the growing whiteness of Hawaiʻi and promoted Hawaiʻi as a desirable destination for white visitors and settlers.

In Isabella Bird's *The Hawaiian Archipelago*, Bird defined civilized and uncivilized Kānaka by separating Kānaka from their pre-missionary history. Those who were Christian and followed Western morals and values were civilized, while those who continued to practice any form of Hawaiian culture were uncivilized. Unlike Bliss or Moseley, Bird had sustained personal

[98] Whitney, *The Hawaiian Guide Book*, 33.
[99] Whitney, *The Hawaiian Guide Book*, 4.
[100] Whitney, *The Hawaiian Guide Book*, 30.

interactions with Native Hawaiians over a long period. Bird's opinions of Kānaka moved between critical and sympathetic; and by the end of her travel, she had come to embrace things that she had previously chastised (such as eating poi).

In *Notes by a Naturalist*, Moseley was distanced from any genuine personal interactions with Native Hawaiians. As a scientist, Moseley's worldview was constructed by categories and hierarchies. He thought of Native Hawaiian people, as well as native flora and fauna, as inferior species that would eventually be taken over by everything American. For Moseley and Bliss, Hawai'i was the destiny for white Americans.

What these three writers share in common is that their assumed authority in the "Imagined Hawai'i" was challenged in certain encounters. Bliss was taken aback by the Hawaiian boy's disinterest in retrieving coconuts for money. He assumed that by offering payment, the boy would climb the tree without question. Bliss interpreted the boy's inaction as laziness, whereas the boy perhaps did not want to take orders from a stranger. From Isabella Bird's perspective, she discovered that Hawaiian women had unrestricted access to physical activities such as swimming, surfing, and riding horseback astride. Bird saw Christianity and Western culture as liberating Kānaka from an "uncivilized" Hawaiian lifestyle, yet it is the same Hawaiian lifestyle that allowed Bird to breach the gendered constrictions of the Victorian Era. In Henry Moseley's scene with Kalākaua aboard the *Challenger*, Moseley admitted his surprise towards Kalākaua's fashion and scientific knowledge. In *The Cambridge Introduction to Travel Writing*, Tim Youngs stated that, "If identities and meanings are sometimes imposed on others in and through travel writing, they are often unsettled, questioned and mediated."[101] In the previous examples, each writer is confronted by the realities of cross-cultural and interracial encounters.

Henry Whitney's *Guide Book* differed in style from the other three writers, as it was a guidebook rather than a personal account. Whitney was not the protagonist of his own writing nor did he offer a stream of unfiltered opinions like Bliss, Bird, or Moseley. Rather than personal elevation, Whitney's goal was strictly to promote Hawai'i as a viable destination for visitors and settlers. The narrative of progress portrayed Hawai'i and its people as modernized, which was more welcoming to foreigners. From Whitney's position as a tourism promoter, it would not make sense to question the civility of Native Hawaiians or to bring up any negative stereotypes such as stealing or lying. Instead, Whitney exoticized Kānaka as objects of observation as if they

[101] Youngs, 12.

were part of the paradisical landscape. By moving them into the backdrop (away from the reader), he could make Kānaka invisible in plain sight.

All four writers used the narrative of extinction to suggest or predict that Hawai‘i would or should become the inheritance of the growing white (American) population. The narrative of extinction actually occurs in two parts. The first part is the physical extinction (i.e. death) of native Hawaiians (lowercase n). If the majority population was declining, this would mean there was an opening for minority populations like white settlers. The second part is a figurative extinction, which pertains to the haole definition of Kānaka ‘Ōiwi, separating native Hawaiian from mixed/half-caste. These writers thought of Kānaka such as Queen Emma, Bill Ragsdale, and Rev. Thomas Martin as not being "true" because they were mixed. Mixed or half-caste Hawaiians were considered to better than "natives" but not equal to whites. This is comparable with the American racial ideologies of the time concerning mixed Blacks and mixed Native Americans, who lived in a sort of racial purgatory.

The figurative extinction of Kānaka ‘Ōiwi worked in conjunction with the narrative of progression. Kānaka were biologically progressing because their "nativeness" had been diluted by white blood. If they were becoming more white, this meant that they were further away from their savage and heathen past. Travel writers equated "whiteness" with civility, so mixed Hawaiians were becoming biologically "civilized", which meant "progress" for the Kingdom. This is why Henry Whitney happily wrote that the new, mixed population was the future of Hawai‘i.

The four travel writings that I have discussed in this chapter express the theme of Kānaka ‘Ōiwi through various narratives, especially the narratives of progress, civility, and extinction. In a generalized synthesis, these 1870s travel writers viewed Kānaka as mostly civilized due to Christianity and Western culture, but still inferior to whites. They focused on criticizing the general population of Kānaka rather than the reigning ali‘i and monarchy. They thought that native Hawaiians (lowercase n) were going to die by the end of the century, leaving Hawai‘i to the Euro-Americans, Asian immigrants, and the remaining mixed-race population. These narratives were important to travel writing and Hawai‘i's new travel industry because it created an "Imagined Hawai‘i" that was balanced between the exotic (Hawaiian people, land, culture) and the familiar (white people, Western culture, and modern infrastructure). Hawai‘i was a paradise structured for the unrestricted consumption by white visitors and settlers.

As the Hawaiian Kingdom changed and as various political issues arose at the 19th century, many of the antagonistic narratives concerning the general Native Hawaiian population diminished. However, travel writers began to openly attack the legitimacy and the effectiveness of the ruling aliʻi and the Hawaiian government. Travel writing became propaganda for expressing anti-monarchy and pro-American annexation sentiment, creating a newer version of the "Imagined Hawaiʻi" in the 1890s.

-Ch. 3-
Pilikia in Paradise: the "Imagined Hawai'i" in the 1890s

In the city, immigrants
claiming to be natives;

in the country, natives
without a nation:
The democracy of colonies.

For the foreigner, romances
of "Aloha,"
For Hawaiians,
dispossessions of empire.

–Haunani-Kay Trask, "Dispossessions of Empire", in *Night is a Sharkskin Drum*.

In this excerpt from her poem "Dispossessions of Empire", scholar and poet Haunani-Kay Trask juxtaposed two perspectives of Hawai'i: the paradise imagined by foreigners and tourists contrasted against the historical and contemporary realities of Kānaka 'Ōiwi who are subjected to the "dispossessions" of American empire. These realities include a multitude of issues such as health, houselessness, sovereignty, land and natural resource management, cultural exploitation, etc. These pilikia (issues) are often overshadowed by the romanticization of Hawai'i perpetuated by the travel industry and other forms of mainstream media.[1]

In this chapter, I traverse the intersection of travel writing and the pilikia of politics in Hawai'i during the last decade of the 19th century and the first years of the 20th century. During this period, there were several key events: the 1893 overthrow, Robert Wilcox's 1895 rebellion, the successful royalist petition against annexation in 1897, the 1898 "annexation" of Hawai'i by the United States, and lastly, the official start of the Territorial Era in 1900. Travel writing in this time was heavily politicized and in favor of dismantling the monarchy and establishing American rule. Publications tracked political events and changes in Hawai'i, essentially acting like history books for its readers. The purpose of traversing this intersection of travel writing and politics is to understand how travel writers remembered, misremembered, or "forgot" various political events in order to rationalize the end of the Hawaiian Kingdom and the beginning of American rule. This results in the culminating theme of destiny and inheritance. In the 1870s, travel writers were only speculating that Hawai'i would perhaps be ruled by Euro-Americans in

[1] The word "pilikia" can be also defined as: trouble, problem, distress, affliction, etc.

the near future. The reality of this destiny became apparent during the course of the 1890s, as writers used their publications as propaganda to protect their new inheritance.

The culminating theme of destiny and inheritance was rationalized by three narratives that I refer to as the three P's: popularity, protection, and progress. The narrative of progress is identical to the narrative of progress in 1870s travel writing, based upon religious, cultural, and political ideology. If Kānaka ʻŌiwi had progressed morally due to Chrisitanity, the next logical step was to progress politically by ending the so-called "oppressive" monarchial rule. In the 1890s, travel writers wrote that Native Hawaiians would find further enlightenment under the guidance of an American style democracy instead of a constitutional monarchy. The progression of Kānaka as "civilized" also meant that they would be ideal American citizens in the case of annexation. This was a key point because many Americans were hesitant in accepting a large body of non-white foreigners as American citizens. Travel writers needed to convince readers that Native Hawaiians could be fully incorporated and Americanized.

The second P is the narrative of popularity; in which certain writers referred to the 1893 overthrow as a "people's revolution" or a "popular uprising". By framing the overthrow as a popular movement, travel writers subversively silenced and ignored the many voices of protest against the overthrow and American annexation. If readers believed the general population of Hawaiʻi was unified against the monarchy, then the actions of the usurpers would be legitimized and unquestioned.

Protection is the final narrative of the 3 P's. The narrative of protection suggested that Kānaka ʻŌiwi needed American protection because their "nativeness" made them unfit for self-rule. Nativeness is to the romanticized and stereotyped construction of Kānaka as apathetic, pleasure seeking, simple, sensual, and most of all, inferior.[2] Protection is also synonymous with paternalism, as America viewed Native Hawaiians, Puerto Ricans, Native Americans, Filipinos, etc., as children who needed parental supervision. The narrative of protection was a way Americans argued that American control was for the benefit of Native Hawaiians.

[2] "Nativeness" is similar to the idea of the "noble savage". Militarism and the feminization of the Hawaiian Islands is another type of "protection" narrative in the 20th century. The feminization of Hawaiʻi as a "damsel in distress" or a "hula girl" legitimizes the U.S. military's control and occupation of Hawaiʻi. For a more detailed discussion see: Haunani-Kay Trask, "Lovely Hula Hands: Corporate Tourism and the Prostitution of Hawaiian Culture" in *From A Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaiʻi*, Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press, 1999, and Phyllis Turnbull and Kathy E. Ferguson, "Military Presence/Missionary Past: The Historical Construction of Masculine Order and Feminine Hawaiʻi" *Social Process in Hawaiʻi: Sites, Identities, and Voices* 38, 1997.

Like the narratives in 1870s, travel writers did not necessarily deploy all three narratives equally into their respective publications; some writers invested heavily into one narrative, while others engaged in a combination of narratives. Additionally, the comparison of narratives between two writers may seem contradictory. For example, one writer could state that Kānaka were civilized (narrative of progress), while another writer could say that they were primitive (narrative of protection). However, both of these statements support the specific narrative in that context.

These three narratives funnel into the same direction: creating the allure that there was no pilikia in paradise. If there was no pilikia then the destiny of an American governed Hawai‘i was made true for readers. Erasing pilikia also helped writers portray Hawai‘i as a stable and still desirible travel destination. If visitors and settlers thought the Hawai‘i was in political limbo or at risk for a violent revolution, the still-emerging travel industry could be devastatingly crippled.

Going beyond the 1890s and early 20th century, the narratives of progress, popularity, and protection formed the foundations of "the Narrative" (capitol N). The Narrative is the popular historical narrative that dominated almost the entirety of the 20th century: the passivity of Native Hawaiians post-1893. As Noenoe Silva stated in *Aloha Betrayed*, "One of the most persistant and pernicious myths of Hawaiian history is that the Kanaka Maoli passively accepted the erosion of their culture and the loss of their nation."[3] The Narrative is a product of the "cultural bomb" of imperialism, a concept coined by literary scholar Ngugi Wa Thiong`o:

> But the biggest weapon wielded and actually daily unleashed by imperialism against that collective defiance is the cultural bomb. The effect of a cultural bomb is to annihilate a people's belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves. It makes them see their past as one wasteland of non-achievement and it makes them want to distance themselves from that wasteland. It makes them want to identify with that which is furthest removed from themselves…It even plants serious doubts about the moral rightness of struggle. Possibilities of triumph or victory are seen as remote, ridiculous dreams.[4]

As Thiong`o argued, the ability to colonize the mind (and therefore history) is the greatest weapon of the oppressor. By looking back at travel writing produced in the intense political

[3] Noenoe K. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004), 1.
[4] Ngugi Wa Thiong`o, *Decolonising the Mind*, (Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann, 1986), 3.

climate of the 1890s and early 20th century, one can see why the Narrative dominated most of the 20th century, and its lingering effects on contemporary Hawai‘i.

The selection of travel writings in this chapter is: *A Trip to Hawaii* by Charles Warren Stoddard (1892, 1897, 1901 editions), *Hawaiian Life: Being Lazy, Letters From Low Altitude* also by Stoddard (1894), John L. Stevens and W. B. Oleson's *Picturesque Hawaii* (1895), *The Tourists' Guide Through the Hawaiian Islands, Descriptive of Their Scenes and Scenery* by Henry M. Whitney (1895), *Frances Stuart Parker: Reminiscences and Letters* by Frances Stuart Parker (1907), and lastly, Emma Nākuina's *Hawaii: Its People Their Legends* (1904).

As mentioned in Chapter 1, Charles Warren Stoddard was a prolific writer during his lifetime. *A Trip to Hawaii* was a guide book written by Stoddard and commissioned by the Oceanic Steamship Company. The second publication, *Hawaiian Life*, was a personal account of Stoddard's experiences in Hawai‘i. John L. Stevens and W. B. Oleson were very well known figures in late 19th century Hawai‘i. Their joint guidebook *Picturesque Hawai‘i* is perhaps the clearest attempt to rationalize the overthrow and to support annexation. *Frances Stuart Parker* was a posthumous collection of Frances Stuart Parker's travel accounts. Parker and her husband came to Hawai‘i in the summer of 1898 to teach summer school.

Emma Nākuina and her publication *Hawaii: Its People Their Legends* (1904) are an exception to the narratives of the 3 P's. Nākuina, talented and highly respected in her time, was the first Kānaka ‘Ōiwi to author a travel guidebook for Hawai‘i. The way she constructed *Hawaii: Its People Their Legends* is significantly different than any other travel writing; as evident by its title, Nākuina used her publication to celebrate her ‘āina kulāiwi (homeland), her people, and their mo‘olelo.

Within a decade, four different political structures existed in Hawai‘i: the Hawaiian Kingdom, the Provisional Government (P.G.), the Republic of Hawai‘i, and the Territory of Hawai‘i. The Hawaiian Kingdom was established by Kamehameha I; he was succeeded by his sons, Liholiho (II) and Kauikeaouli (III), and his grandsons Alexander Liholiho (IV) and Lot Kapuāiwa (V). Lunalilo succeeded Lot Kapuāiwa; and upon the death of Lunalilo in 1874, the Kamehameha dynasty came to a close. Following the Kamehameha dynasty was the Kalākaua dynasty, which began with the 1874 election of Kalākaua. Kalākaua's sister, Lili‘uokalani, succeeded him after his death in 1891. Kamehameha and Liholiho ruled the Kingdom with

absolute power, while Kauikeaouli and rulers that followed him reigned as constitutional monarchs.[5]

In 1893, Liliʻuokalani ruled the Hawaiian Kingdom under the 1887 Constitution. The 1887 Constitution, also known as the Bayonet Constitution, was a constitution that Kalākaua was forced to sign under pressure from members of the haole elite. These Euro-Americans organized as a secret society called the "Hawaiian League"; they conspired to weaken the monarchial system for their own benefit. The Hawaiian League included men such as Lorrin Thurston and Sanford Dole. The 1887 Constitution shifted power away from the monarch and to other parts of the government.[6]

Liliʻuokalani's priority was to create a new constitution to replace the Bayonet Constitution, as requested by many Kānaka. Her proposed constitution would have restored power to the monarchy, which is exactly what the Committee of Safety (formerly the Hawaiian League) did not want to happen.[7] The Committee of Safety was informed of Liliʻu's plan and overthrew Liliʻu on January 17, 1893, with the support of John L. Stevens, the U.S. Minister to the Hawaiian Kingdom.[8] The Committee of Safety declared themselves as the leaders of the new Provisional Government (P.G.) of Hawaiʻi. The Committee had actually already begun to write a treaty of annexation before January 17; the fear of Liliʻu's constitution hastened their actions.

At this time, Benjamin Harrison was the president of the United States (1889-1893). Harrison was an imperialist so the Provisional Government expected annexation to be quickly secured. However, the overthrow was at the tail end of Harrison's term, and Grover Cleveland was about to begin his presidency. In order for the treaty of annexation to be passed, there needed to be a two-thirds majority vote in the U.S. Senate. Republicans were known to be

---

[5] There were four constitutions: 1840 Constistution of the Kingdom, 1852 Constitution of the Kingdom, 1864 Constitution of the Kingdom, and 1887 Constitution of the Kingdom.

[6] One of the crippling changes was that the monarch had less power over the Cabinet, Legislature, and House of Nobles. Additionally, there were major changes in voting eligibility; only Native Hawaiians, Europeans, and Americans could vote, and they also needed to own a certain amount of property, make a certain amount of income, and be literate. These restrictions limited Native Hawaiians voters and shut out Asian immigrant laborers from voting. Native Hawaiians were the majority of the population, while the immigrant laborers outnumbered Euro-Americans. See: Kingdom of Hawaiʻi Constitution of 1887. Granted by Kalakaua Rex., July 6, 1887. Hawaiian Independence. http://www.hawaii-nation.org/constitution-1887.html.

[7] Liliʻuokalani, *Hawaiʻi's Story by Hawaiʻi's Queen*, (Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1990), 237. As the Queen stated, "It is alleged that my proposed constitution was to make such changes as to give to the sovereign more power, and to the cabinet or legislature less, and that only subjects…could exercise suffrage."

[8] The overthrow was supported by a show of force by soldiers from the *USS Boston*, which was docked in Honolulu harbor.

expansionist, while Democrats tended to be isolationists.[9] The U.S. Senate was never able to vote on the treaty, and Harrison's presidency expired.

When Cleveland started his term in March 1893, he withdrew the P. G.'s treaty of annexation from the Senate. Then he sent former Congressman James Blount (Georgia) to Hawai'i to investigate the Overthrow.[10] The Provisional Government was hopeful because they assumed that Blount would write a favorable report due to his Southern heritage. Before Blount had even reached Hawai'i, Kānaka 'Ōiwi had already mounted their own effort. They formed Hui Hawai'i Aloha 'Āina (men's chapter) and Hui Hawai'i Aloha 'Āina o Nā Wāhine (women's chapter).[11] Both chapters of the Hui were essential in contributing to Blount's report. They submitted written testimony, an organizational statement, and a history of the events leading up to the Overthrow; and they asked President Cleveland for his support. The Hui also explained that Kānaka 'Ōiwi were perfectly capable of self-rule and that any troubles in the Islands were a result of foreigners. These testimonies and statements became a part of Blount's report.[12] Blount finished his report on July 17, 1893 and submitted it to Cleveland. His report ultimately supported the restoration of Lili'uokalani.

President Cleveland removed Minister John L. Stevens from his duty, and replaced him with Albert Willis. In order to be returned to the throne, President Cleveland wanted Lili'u to grant amnesty to the members of the Committee of Safety, and she also needed to follow the 1887 constitution as well. Lili'uokalani did not want to grant amnesty to the Committee because she wanted them to be charged and kicked out of Hawai'i, negotiations for restoration were prolonged because of this.[13] On December 18, 1893, the Queen's assistant, James Carter, told

---

[9] George F. Pierce, "Assessing Public Opinion: Editorial Comment and the Annexation of Hawai'i: A Case Study," *Pacific Historical Review* 43, no. 4, (1974), 331. United States Secretary of State, John Foster tried to secure more Democratic votes for annexation. He was assured by Democratic senators John Morgan and A. P. Gorman that there would be enough Democrats to make the majority vote.

[10] Blount served in office from 1873 to 1893. He went on his investigation as a private citizen. He served on the House Commitee of Foreign Relations during a part of his term.

[11] Noenoe K. Silva, "Kū'ē! Hawaiian Women's Resistance to the Annexation," *Social Process in Hawai'i, Women in Hawai'i: Sites, Identities, and Voices* 38, (1997), 8. The phrase "Aloha 'Āina" was used as the group's name because aloha 'āina refers to one's feeling of pride and loyalty to Hawai'i (as a homeland), as well as politcal support for the Hawaiian monarchy. The hui was founded by Hawaiians such as Joseph Nāwahī and James Kaulia. The members were able to hold mass meetings, petitions, and testimonies between 1893 and 1898. Hui Aloha 'Āina was essential in the efforts to support Lili'uokalani and the interest of Kānaka. The women's chapter was led by Kuaihelani Campbell and Emma Nāwahī.

[12] Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 131-132.

[13] Keanu Sai, *Ua Mau Ke Ea Sovereignty Endures: An Overview of the Political and Legal History of Hawai'i,* (Honolulu, Pū'ā Foundation, 2011), 76-77.

Willis that the Queen would grant amnesty to the men but would not return their property. However, later that day, the Queen told Willis that she would accept the full terms.[14]

On the same day, President Cleveland wrote a message to the American Senate and House of Representatives. In his letter, he supported the findings of Blount's investigation. Cleveland questioned the legitimacy of the Provisional Government of Hawai'i and denounced their actions. He also blasted U.S. Minister Stevens for his role in aiding the Committee of Safety and for calling upon American troops. Cleveland concluded:

> I believe that a candid and thorough examination of the facts will force the conviction that the provisional government owes its existence to an armed invasion by the United States. Fair-minded people with the evidence before them will *hardly claim that the Hawaiian Government was overthrown by the people of the islands or that the provisional government had ever existed with their consent. I do not understand that any member of this government claims that the people would uphold it by their suffrages if they were allowed to vote on the question*.[15]

During the early part of 1894, Sanford Dole grew worried that the P.G. would be terminated; therefore, the Provisional Government became the Republic of Hawai'i in mid 1894. For some reason, Minister Willis decided to recognize the Republic of Hawai'i as a legitimate entity. Sanford Dole, now president of the Republic, stated that, "we do not recognize the right of the President of the United States to interfere in our domestic affairs."[16]

Back in Washington D.C., Congressman John Morgan (Alabama) was commissioned to investigate and counter the findings in Blount's Report.[17] Annexationists thought Blount's investigation was unfair because he failed to interview anybody from the Committee of Safety.

---

[14] Sai, 76-77. Sai argued that the terms of negotiations made no sense under Hawaiian law. In order to grant amnesty to the Committee of Safety, they would need to be tried and convicted first.

[15] Cleveland, Grover. President Cleveland's Message. Hawaiian Independence. http://www.hawaii-nation.org/cleveland.html. Italicization my own.

[16] Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 170. Now that his short-lived government was on verge of non-existence, Dole told the U.S. to back off, despite that just a year before, the P.G. had begged the U.S. to accept their treaty. Queen Lili'uokalani felt so betrayed by Minister Willis' decision to support the Republic. She sent a commission to Washington D.C. to protest to Cleveland. Cleveland was not able to meet with the commission, however, he wrote a written response (in August). In his written response, Cleveland denied his responsibility to undo what Stevens and Willis had done. He claimed that he could not interfere with the affairs of another independent country. This letter was never communicated with Lili'u, so she did not understand why her commission returned empty handed. Silva hypothesized that the commission withheld the letter from the Queen because they knew she would be disappointed. Lili'u thought of Cleveland as a close-ally and friend.

[17] Morgan was known as a fervent supporter of annexation; he was also a former Confederate soldier and Grand Dragon of the Ku Klux Klan.

The conclusion of Morgan's report was that the United States had no responsibility in the 1893 overthrow. The Republican senators used the Morgan Report to attack Cleveland's policy towards Hawai'i.[18] As a result of the Morgan Report; the U.S. Senate passed a resolution barring the U.S. and other countries from intervening in the affairs of Hawai'i.[19]

As a response, a group of Kānaka decided an armed resistance was necessary. Robert Wilcox, a Native Hawaiian politician and soldier, secured a gun shipment on January 4, 1895.[20] The arms were stored at the house of Henry Bertelmann in Kāhala, O'ahu. Republic officials went to the house and a shootout took place.[21] Wilcox and a group of supporters retreated to Lē'ahi (Diamond Head), then into Mānoa, and finally surrendered in Kalihi on the 14th of January. Robert Wilcox became a hero to royalists (supporters of the monarchy) and became a symbol of resistance.[22] Following the rebellion, a weapons stash was "found" on the grounds of Washington Place, where Lili'u lived. The Republic used this as an opportunity to arrest her.[23]

In 1896, Republican William McKinley succeeded Cleveland as president, and a second treaty of annexation emerged in 1897. In response, Hui Aloha 'Āina, along with other royalist groups collected 38,000 signatures, which stopped this second attempt at annexation. This petition is called the 1897 Petition Against Annexation, more popularly known as the Kū'ē Petitions.[24]

Finally, in 1898, the forces of imperialism could no longer be suppressed. The United States had entered the Spanish-American War, and its need for colonies intensified. Along with Samoa, Guam, and Puerto Rico, Hawai'i was taken as a territory of the United States.[25] With the

---

[18] Ralph Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom, vol. 3, 1874-1893, The Kalakaua dynasty,* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1967), 647-648.
[19] Sai, 82.
[20] Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 138. An earlier shipment of guns was compromised because the Republic had spies among the royalists. John Bush and Joseph Nāwahī, two important members of Hui Aloha 'Āina were arrested on December 8, 1894.
[21] Lili'uokalani, 266.
[22] Kānaka wrote numerous mele (songs or chants) in honor of Lili'uokalani and about Wilcox's rebellion. These were compiled as *Buke Mele Lāhui: Book of National Songs,* (Honolulu, Hawai'i: Hawaiian Historical Society, 2003).
[23] Lili'uokalani, 263. Lili'u claimed she had no knowledge of the weapons. In response to the events, she said, "If the mass of the native people chose to rise, and try to throw off the yoke, I would say nothing against it, but I could not approve of mere rioting."
[24] Noenoe K. Silva, ''I Kū Mau Mau: How Kanaka Tried to Sustain National Identity Within the United States Political System," *American Studies* 45 no. 3, (2004), 10.
[25] The U.S. government realized that the only way they could secure voluntary annexation was through a vote. However, both the U.S. and Republic of Hawai'i knew that there was no way Kānaka 'Ōiwi, the majority of the population, would approve. Therefore, the U.S. decided to "annex" Hawai'i through joint resolution, which is

passing of the Organic Act in 1900, the Territorial Government (1900-1959) was officially established. Sanford Dole, an original member of the Hawaiian League/Committee of Safety and president of the former Republic became the first governor of the Territory of Hawai‘i.

A Trip to Hawaii by Charles Warren Stoddard (1897 and 1901)

Stoddard (1843-1909) was a highly regarded American poet and writer from the mid 19th century until his death in 1909. Unlike most travel writers he visited Hawai‘i several times because his parents owned a grocery store on Maui and his sister had married a sugar planter.[26] Stoddard wrote two travel books about Hawai‘i: *A Trip to Hawaii* (1885, re-prints in 1892, 1897, 1901) and *Hawaiian Life: Being Lazy, Letters From Low Latitudes* (1894).

Stoddard's *A Trip to Hawaii* is a tourist guide book commissioned and published by The San Francisco-based Oceanic Steamship Company (OCS). The OCS transported goods and passengers between Hawai‘i, the United States, New Zealand, and Australia.[27] According to an article in the Honolulu newspaper *The Daily Bulletin*, 5000 copies of the 1892 version of *A Trip to Hawaii* were printed for distribution along the West Coast.[28]

The value of *A Trip to Hawaii* is not the main section of text but actually the introduction. The 1892, 1897, 1901 re-prints of *A Trip to Hawaii* have almost the exact text as the original 1885 version. However, the difference is that each version has a slightly different introduction. The 1892 introduction is the base text for the introductions in the 1897 and 1901 versions. Additionally, Charles Warren Stoddard did not actually pen the introduction(s) to *A Trip to Hawaii*; it was anonymously authored, most likely by an OCS representative.

In the 1897 introduction, the writer updated readers on the events that took place after the publishing of the 1892 edition, mostly about the overthrow in 1893. The writer stated that the Hawaiian monarchy was no more and that "the manner of its fall, although the matter of much heated controversy, has left the power in the hands of the white population."[29] Hawai‘i was no longer a monarchy ruled by Hawaiian ali‘i instead it was ruled by "grave-faced American

---

something that can only be recognized within the borders of the United States. This is why those who support the return of Hawaiian sovereignty believe the 1898 "annexation" was illegal.

[26] Paul Lyons, *American Pacifism: Oceania in the U.S. Imagination*, (New York, Rutledge: 2006), 122.

[27] Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom, vol. 3, 1874-1893, The Kalakaua dynasty,* 61. This shipping line was founded in 1881 by John Spreckles, the son of Hawai‘i sugar baron Claus Spreckles.

[28] "To Boom Hawaii," *The Daily Bulletin,* (Honolulu, Hawaii), 6 October 1892.

[29] Charles Warren Stoddard, *A Trip to Hawaii*, (San Francisco: Oceanic Steamship Co., 1897), v.

business men."[30] The author explained to the readers that it was important to inform them of changes and "testify to all the world that the charm of Hawaii is in itself, and not in its form of government, that no revolution or political change can take away from the inherent enjoyableness of a trip to the land of afternoons."[31] The purpose of this introduction was to quell visitors' uncertainties about the stability of Hawai'i's political situation. The writer attempted to divert the readers' attention away from politics and towards the Hawaiian landscape.

The 1902 introduction continued to keep prospective tourists up to date on the political happenings since 1897, which was the transition from Republic to Territory. In the following excerpt, the writer assured readers that the government was stable and safe from Native Hawaiian resistance:

> Even the Hawaiian Republic, which was in power in 1897…has gone its way, and now Hawaii is a Territory of the United States, doubtless so to remain, *forever free from danger of revolution and internal strife.* Hawaii has passed through her first political campaign under American methods, and in spite of all attempts to make the natives align themselves with American national parties they voted solidly for a man [Robert Wilcox] representing their own feelings, and have sent him to represent them at Washington. President Dole is now Governor Dole...and the legislature is composed in large majority of native Hawaiians.[32]

The prospective traveler did not have to worry about "revolutions and internal strife" because Hawai'i had progressed into the protective hands of America. The writer alluded to the election of Robert Wilcox as Hawai'i's representative in the U.S. congress. Wilcox, the symbol of Hawaiian resistance, was elected by the people in order to give Kānaka a voice in the American government. However, because Hawai'i was a territory of the U.S., any action by Wilcox or the Native Hawaiian-filled legislature could be overruled by the territorial system. The writer explained that, "the American Constitution, the veto of Governor Dole, and the decisions of a District Judge from the mainland [U.S.] will prevent a Hawaiian legislature from doing anything very radical."[33] For readers, this meant that Hawai'i was officially a part of America without any chance of reverting to an independent state.

---

[30] Stoddard, *A Trip to Hawaii*, 1897, vi.
[31] Stoddard, *A Trip to Hawaii,* 1897, vi.
[32] Charles Warren Stoddard, *A Trip to Hawaii,* (San Francisco: Oceanic Steamship Co., 1901), vi. Italicization my own.
[33] Stoddard, *A Trip to Hawaii,* 1901, vi.

Hawaiian Life: Being Lazy, Letters From Low Latitudes by Charles Warren Stoddard (1894)

In contrast to *A Trip to Hawaii*, Stoddard's *Hawaiian Life* was a personal account rather than a guidebook.[34] Stoddard's own opinion of Hawaiian-American political relations was greatly shaped by his sympathetic feelings toward Kānaka ʻŌiwi. As mentioned in Chapter 1, Stoddard had intimate relationships with Hawaiian men during his previous visits to Hawaiʻi. This may have contributed towards his more sympathetic, but paternalistic, views towards Kānaka. As a result of Stoddard's paternalism and romanticization of Hawaiians as happy natives, he believed that Kānaka needed to be protected.

From the beginning of the text, Stoddard was enchanted by the "simple and natural life of the islander"[35]; a life that was also "sensuous and picturesque."[36] He expressed, "Among them no laws are valid save Nature's own, but they abide faithfully by these."[37] Thus Kānaka were hyper natural beings bound to nothing except nature. As in the title of the publication, *Hawaiian Life*, Stoddard himself desired to live the so-called "Hawaiian life", where he could live simply, be "lazy", and be as "natural" as Kānaka.

Stoddard also commented on effects of disease on Kānaka ʻŌiwi and criticized the role of American missionaries for the corruption of "Hawaiian life". From the arrival of Captain Cook in 1778 and throughout the 19th century, foreign introduced diseases devastated the Native Hawaiian population. Stoddard pointed to the arrival of the missionaries as a significant factor, he charged that, "Puritanism touches [Native Hawaiians] like frost."[38] Stoddard may have been a bit biased against the Puritans as he was a member of the Catholic Church.

Continuing his criticism, he wrote, "Having spied the gentlest of savages out of the lonely sea for the purpose of teaching them how to die, the American Missionary calmly folds his hand

[34] Stoddard exhibited his skills as a writer; his descriptions are much more poetic, grandiose and romanticized in comparison to *A Trip to Hawaiʻi*. Most of the chapters in *Hawaiian Life* are written as a letters addressed to a certain "type" of person such as: "aboriginal", "deluded navigator", "herr professor", "miserable American", etc. The content of the chapter is themed (loosely) around the addressee. For example, the chapter titled "In the Market-place" is addressed to the "gentle angler"; in which Stoddard described the sight of various types of fish found in the open market of Honolulu. *Hawaiian Life* does not pertain to a specific visit by Stoddard but rather a compilation of experiences.
[35] Charles Warren Stoddard, *Hawaiian Life: Being Lazy Letters From Low Latitudes*, (Chicago: F. Tennyson Neely, 1894), 108.
[36] Stoddard, *Hawaiian Life*, 109.
[37] Stoddard, *Hawaiian Life,* 109.
[38] Stoddard, *Hawaiian Life,* 238.

over the grave of the nation and turns his attention to affairs more private and peculiar."[39] This is a multi-layered statement. Kānaka, "the gentlest of savages", are positioned as victims of the ABCFM mission. Stoddard questioned the effectiveness of the mission itself. If Kānaka were dying from introduced diseases, and religion offered salvation and eternal life, then the missionaries were "teaching them how to die." In the second half of the statement, Stoddard alluded to the missionary descendants (such as Lorrin Thurston) who benefited from their positions in society and became invested in "affairs more private and peculiar" of the Hawaiian Kingdom.

Stoddard targeted the missionaries once more. He informed readers that Native Hawaiian had never practiced cannibalism. However, he argued that, "if there has been any human roasting done in this domain, it has been done since the arrival of the American missionaries."[40] In Stoddard's view, the missionaries and their descendants did not bring or create progress; instead, Kānaka needed to be protected from them.

In the chapter titled, "How the King Came Home", Stoddard reminisced about his 1881 encounter with Kalākaua, as the king returned from his voyage around the world. Stoddard happened to be on the same ship heading to Honolulu. He described Kalākaua as having the "languid ease, the consoling fatalism, the gladsome superstition of his race. It was bred in the bone, and the tours of forty worlds could not have educated him out of it. He showed less of it than the majority of people, knowing well how to disguise it."[41] Here, Stoddard contended that Kalākaua's nativeness was a biological trait, something that the king could not escape from, no matter if he had traveled the world.

In conversation with Kalākaua, Stoddard claimed Kalākaua said that Americans needed "an emperor, and that the United States must become an empire."[42] There is no way to confirm if Kalākaua actually said this or if it was Stoddard's poetic imagining, but it makes for an interesting conversation. Kalākaua himself was not an emperor, he ruled as a constitutional monarch. The president of the United States was also bound to a constitution as well. Perhaps Kalākaua was inspired by his visits with other world leaders during his world trip, which included the Emperor of Japan, who ruled with absolute power. What was Kalākaua's definition

[39] Stoddard, *Hawaiian Life,* 238.
[40] Stoddard, *Hawaiian Life*, 272-273.
[41] Stoddard, *Hawaiian Life,* 114-115.
[42] Stoddard, *Hawaiian Life,* 115.

of "empire"; did empire mean imperial expansion, or was it just the state of which an emperor ruled over? More importantly, what did empire mean to Stoddard (and convey to his audience) in the context of 1894?

Stoddard directly and indirectly addressed the events surrounding the 1893 overthrow of Lili'uokalani and the Hawaiian Kingdom. He explained that after the death of Kalākaua, "the deposed Queen took the throne. It is too evident that her advisers are responsible for her downfall."[43] Stoddard blamed Lili'u's advisors (in this case, her cabinet) rather than towards Lili'uokalani or the members of the Committee of Safety. Some of her cabinet refused to sign her proposed constitution of 1893 and had informed the Committee of Safety of her actions. Because Stoddard was so openly sympathetic to Kānaka, it is unsurprising that he did not criticize the monarchy like other writers. Stoddard's most amusing comments appeared at a seemingly random point in his writing, where he broke out into a sort of internal monologue:

> Ah me! Again and yet again, ah me! Will they rob these *gentle* people of their birthright and their crown? *Protect* them certainly: *they need protection*. They have been *at the mercy* of unscrupulous whites ever since the days of that old pirate Captain Cook. He began it, and the whalers continued it, and the scheming politicians have concluded it. It is an ungodly record, but such [as] one as the white man is apt to make whenever he finds himself among those who are unacquainted with his wiles. They need protection in Hawaii. America is the natural godfather of the Kingdom. *Let America protect them---but annex them, never!*[44]

Once again, the nativeness of Kānaka rendered them as "gentle people" who are "at the mercy" of Euro-Americans. Stoddard paralleled the victimized Kānaka against the "scheming" and "unscrupulous" Euro-Americans and their "wiles". Stoddard's paternalistic (and ironic) solution called for the protection of Kānaka and Kānaka nativeness from white Americans by white America, the "natural godfather" of the Hawaiian Kingdom. Stoddard separated protection from annexation, whereas other writers saw annexation as a form of so-called protection.

Stoddard's monologue is the epitome of how he viewed the relationships between Kānaka, Euro-Americans, politics, and nativeness throughout *Hawaiian Life*. In his construction of nativeness, Kānaka were vulnerable because they were simple and bound to nature. Their inherent nativeness made them victims and susceptible to Euro-American schemes. This is why

[43] Stoddard, *Hawaiian Life*, 119.
[44] Stoddard, *Hawaiian Life,* 206. Italicization my own.

Stoddard's sympathy towards Native Hawaiians was manifested in his paternalistic solution of American "protection". Despite his construct of Hawaiian nativeness and his call for protection, Stoddard is one of the very few travel writers who was sympathetic towards Kānaka, let alone critical of the 1893 Overthrow and Euro-American power in Hawai'i.

Picturesque Hawaii: A Charming Description of Her Unique History, Strange People, Exquisite Climate, Wondrous Volcanoes, Luxurious Productions, Beautiful Cities, Corrupt Monarchy, Recent Revolution and Provisional Government. by Hon. John L. Stevens and Prof. W.B. Oleson (1894)

Stevens and Oleson's *Picturesque Hawaii* is the most blatantly pro-American publication in this selection; its subtitle leaves nothing to the imagination. The backgrounds of the authors, Oleson and Stevens, are just as interesting as the text. William Brewster "W. B." Oleson (1851-1915) was a well-known reverend and teacher in the Hawaiian Kingdom. He was the secretary of the Hawaiian Board of Missions and was the first president of Kamehameha Schools, serving from 1886-1893. Prior to his post at Kamehameha, Oleson headed the Hilo boarding school from 1878-1886.[45] In the speech turned article "Suppression of Hawaiian Culture at Kamehameha Schools" (2004), Hawaiian language teacher Kāwika Eyre described Oleson as a "fervid democrat with no time for monarchies."[46]

John L. Stevens (1820-1895) was the U.S. Minister to Hawai'i from 1891-1893, the very same John L. Stevens who had supported the overthrow of Lili'uokalani, and later fired by President Cleveland. He is also remembered for his infamous post-overthrow exclamation: "The Hawaiian pear is fully ripe, and this is the golden hour to pluck it."[47] Simply, *Picturesque Hawaii* was Stevens' attempt to explain his part in the events of the overthrow and why a Euro-American controlled government was in the best interest of Hawai'i; it was his manifesto. Why Oleson and Stevens decided to team up, and why they choose the guide book route is unclear.

True to its title, *Picturesque Hawaii* was intended to showcase images of Hawai'i and the "Hawaiian life". The publication was formatted as a series of eight portfolios. Each portfolio

[45] "W. B. Oleson Is Called By Death On Health Trip," *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, (April 3, 1915).
[46] Kāwika Eyre, "Suppression of Hawaiian Culture at Kamehameha Schools," Kamehameha Schools, 2004. Oleson was also responsible for stopping the teaching of 'ōlelo Hawai'i at Kamehameha.
[47] Skwiot, 15.

included twelve black and white photos, while the sections of text focused on particular aspects of Hawai‘i. For example “Portfolio No. 3” was titled “An Account of the Soil—Climate—Productions, etc.” and “Portfolio No. 5” was “An Account of the Wonders of Volcanic Eruptions”. At times, it is hard to tell whether the writing is Oleson or Stevens’. It is probable that Oleson wrote most of the more touristic sections of *Picturesque Hawaii*, while the political commentary is mostly Stevens’. Portfolios No. 1 “A Concise But Graphic History”, No. 6 “An Account of the Old Monarchy”, No. 7 “A Thrilling Account of the Revolution”, and No. 8 “A Description of the Provisional Government” are most pertinent to this discussion of travel writing narratives.

Picturesque Hawaii focused on depicting Native Hawaiians (the general population) in a more “positive” light. One of the so-called highlights of Hawaiian culture was the hospitality of Kānaka. Ho‘okipa (relatable to hospitality) has always been a part of Hawaiian culture and is evident in Hawaiian mo‘olelo; it is a reciprocal relationship bounded by protocols and etiquette between host and guest (Chapter 4). The authors wrote that, “The Hawaiian is royal in his hospitality, and is generous even to the sacrificing of his last chicken, when the tired traveler stops for food and shelter.”[48] Also, the “The Hawaiian is a veritable Communist at heart. Instead of grasping for all he can get, he divides with his neighbor, and confidently expects his neighbor to divide with him.”[49] The writers believed that hospitality was a trait that was tailored to serve foreign travelers; “Civilization has taught him to put a commercial value on this natural aptitude for good nature, and he puts it to good use in his laudable efforts to help you ashore.”[50]

Ironically, Oleson and Stevens lamented the corruption of Native Hawaiian hospitality by white travelers and settlers:

> The natural hospitality of the Hawaiians is gracious in the extreme. They can not do too much to manifest their good-will and desire for your comfort. It is not surprising that this kindly spirit has been *imposed upon* and been *taken advantage of*, so that it is more cautiously extended than formerly. In this matter there has been in recent years a *lamentable lack of recognition of favors thus bestowed free-handed*. The natural impulse

[48] William B. Oleson and John L. Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii: A Charming Description of Her Unique History, Strange People, Exquisite Climate, Wondrous Volcanoes, Luxurious Productions, Beautiful Cities, Corrupt Monarchy, Recent Revolution and Provisional Government*, (Philadelphia: Hubbard Publishing Company, 1984), 23.
[49] Oleson and Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii*, 21.
[50] Oleson and Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii*, 15.

> of Hawaiians, according to their ability, to hospitably entertain strangers is highly creditable to their race. *Anglo-Saxons must blush for the advantage taken of this disposition by men of their own race*.[51]

The authors celebrated being recipients of hospitality, while promoting hospitality, yet condemn the exploitation of Kānaka ʻŌiwi. Stevens had only been in the islands for three years, and in that time managed to orchestrate the overthrow of the Kingdom that hosted him—the ultimate betrayal. This is a succinct example of anti-conquest and imperialist nostalgia. In *Anarchy of Empire*, Amy Kaplan defined imperialist nostalgia as "the longing to salvage an imagined pristine pre-colonial culture by the same agents of empire—missionaries, anthropologists, travel writers—who have had a hand in destroying it. Imperialist nostalgia disavows the history of violence that yokes the past to the present."[52] The authors reminisced about the "good ole days" when Kānaka would not hesitate to host a visitor, while conveniently "forgetting" that they (the authors) were agents of colonialism themselves, placing the blame on other white people.

Oleson and Stevens' observations of the change and the abuse of hoʻokipa were truthful. The anecdote of traveler William Root Bliss and the hesitant Hawaiian boy in the previous chapter is an example of this. Even though Bliss offered the boy money, he saw the boy as subservient, and Bliss expected to be shown hospitality. Over one hundred years later, the expectance of "Hawaiian hospitality" and the so-called "aloha spirit" are still at the core of the contemporary mass tourism industry.

By casting Kānaka ʻŌiwi in a positive light, the authors sought to prove to readers that the indigenous people of Hawaiʻi were ready to become model American citizens. In a subsection titled "American Sentiment", the authors claimed that Native Hawaiians loved to celebrate the American Fourth of July; probably more so because it was a holiday than because it was a pro-American celebration. They also exclaimed that the Native Hawaiian population and Euro-American population were excited about the American politics, especially in the presidential election.[53] Of course each population was invested in the presidential election, the American president had a huge influence in determining the fate of Hawaiʻi.

Oleson and Stevens took a more paternalistic route in the subsection "Hawaiians and New Hawaii". The oft-repeated phrase "New Hawaii" was their vision of an Americanized

[51] Oleson and Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii*, 21. Italicization my own.
[52] Kaplan, 56.
[53] Oleson and Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii*, 29.

Hawai‘i ruled by Euro-Americans, their version of the “Imagined Hawai‘i”. But where did Kānaka fit into the structure of the “New Hawaii”? The authors reassured that, “it is to be just what the native Hawaiian will make for himself. It needs to be clearly understood that the native Hawaiian has been a full sharer in every constitutional gain under Anglo-Saxon leadership. There is not the slightest distinction in Hawaii on the ground of color.”[54] This was the same Anglo-Saxon leadership that continually undermined Native Hawaiians in the political sphere. To say that there was no racial disparity in Hawai‘i was the denial of the existence of American colonialism.

“Privileges” was another term that the authors used to describe the benefits of the “New Hawaii” to Native Hawaiians. To Oleson and Stevens, “privileges” was synonymous with “liberation” from monarchy. They wrote, “New Hawaii will emancipate the Hawaiian from a spirit of obsequiousness toward royal personages which has proved harmful to the freest development of political independence, and it will also compel him to look out for himself. The Hawaiian to-day would be a better man and citizen if he had learned the lesson of taking care of himself.[55] New Hawaii would distance itself from the Hawaiian Kingdom, the “Old Hawaii”, which the authors believed to be oppressive. This is quite contradictory considering that the Committee of Safety overthrew Lili‘uokalani in order to prohibit her new constitution, a constitution that had been requested by Kānaka ‘Ōiwi themselves. The promises of new privileges and liberaties were just guises used to smooth over the colonial violence.

Fittingly, Oleson and Stevens dedicated two sections, “The Hawaiian Monarchy” and “Natural Sequence of Events”, to re-telling the history of the Hawaiian Kingdom. In the first section, the authors went on an all out assault on any ali‘i who did not align with American values or ambitions. They labeled Kamehameha I as an extremely oppressive ali‘i who had crushed all beneath him, and he provided “no new privileges for the common people, but bound them rather in closer subserviency.”[56] As for the reign of Liholiho, the authors saw the end of the ‘ai kapu as a proverbial “breaking the yoke” of oppression over Native Hawaiians.[57] The only true praise for the monarchy was reserved for the reign of Kauikeaouli, who ruled the “golden

[54] Oleson and Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii*, 30.
[55] Oleson and Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii*, 30.
[56] Oleson and Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii*, 79.
[57] Oleson and Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii*, 79-80.

era of the Hawaiian race."[58] The writers saw his reign as progressive due to the establishment of a constitutional monarchy and being more welcoming towards Euro-American settlers.

Oleson and Stevens also found the time in their rant to take shots at the French and British, condemning the "French aggressions" of Captain LaPlace in 1839 and "English aggressions" of Lord Paulet in 1843.[59] After the "golden era" of Kauikeaouli, the monarchy went in spiraling free fall (in the eyes of the authors). Lota Kapuāiwa had undone some of the golden era progress by instituting a new constitution that restored power to the mōʻī position. The authors likened Lota's reign to that of Kamehameha I.[60] After the death of Lota Kapuāiwa, an election was used to choose the next mōʻī, the candidates being Lunalilo and Kalākaua. Oleson and Stevens accused Kalākaua of introducing the "element of race hatred" because he wanted to put more Native Hawaiians into the government instead of foreigners. Lunalilo, who was the much more popular choice won the election but the authors claimed that he was "elected by the use of bribes."[61]

Following the death of Lunalilo only a year later, Kalākaua was elected as mōʻī, defeating his rival Queen Emma. Oleson and Stevens criticized Kalākaua for playing between the lines, being supported by the Euro-American elite but also trying to elevate Hawaiian culture. They hated Kalākaua's "Hawaii for Hawaiians" slogan and viewed his cultural renaissance as the "revival of heathenism."[62] Kalākaua was stripped of his powers bestowed by the 1864 Constitution when he was forced to sign the 1887 Bayonet Constitution, which the authors referred to as a "liberal constitution".[63] Oleson and Stevens seemed to have a special animosity towards Kalākaua as they dedicated the most pages to his reign that the other aliʻi. They used Kalākaua as a scapegoat in order to prove that his reign was rock bottom for the Kingdom and to justify the need for the Kingdom to be overthrown.

If Oleson and Stevens thought the Hawaiian Kingdom had always been ineffective since its inception under Kamehameha, then the downfall of the monarchy was just a "natural sequence of events." The authors explained:

---

[58] Oleson and Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii*, 81.
[59] Oleson and Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii*, 82-84.
[60] Oleson and Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii*, 85-86.
[61] Oleson and Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii*, 88-89.
[62] Oleson and Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii*, 89-90.
[63] Oleson and Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii*, 86.

> But the monarchy grew rigid. It threw itself across the pathway. It sought to turn the wheels backward, and grew autocratic and arbitrary. With an almost insane temerity, it assumed the role of arbiter, ruled the other party out of court, pronounced judgment, and miserably perished at its own hands.[64]

By focusing on positive characteristics of the Native Hawaiian population while disparaging the monarchy, Oleson and Stevens suggested that Native Hawaiians could find liberation under American rule. If the end of the monarchy was inevitable then American control was Hawai‘i’s destiny.

Oleson and Stevens re-told the events of the overthrow in the section titled “History of the Hawaiian Revolution of January, 1893.” Again, the use of the word “revolution” instead of “overthrow” was a specific word choice that re-framed the event as a noble cause supported by many. Stevens began the section by describing his disappointing first impressions of Hawai‘i upon his arrival in 1889. He encountered:

> an intelligent body of citizens, of European and American origin, sharing the good-will of many native Hawaiians, supporting a semi-barbaric monarchy resting on no solid or normal foundation, dead in everything but its vices, coarsely luxuriant in its tastes and wishes, spreading social and political demoralization throughout the Islands. This semi-heathen and spurious government mechanism, called the Hawaiian Monarchy, was being chiefly supported by the taxes and toleration of those who could have no sincere loyalty to it…[65]

In this excerpt, it is really the European and American populations that Stevens wanted to liberate from monarchial rule. Stevens thought that these populations should not pay taxes or loyalty to a “semi-barbaric” and “semi-heathen” Hawaiian Kingdom. He wrote that after a year of “careful observation”, he knew that this situation “could not continue.”[66] Yet the authors attempted to distance Stevens’ participation and support of the overthrow, denying outright that neither Stevens nor the American military had anything to do with the events of January 17, 1893.[67]

---

[64] Oleson and Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii*, 94.
[65] Oleson and Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii*, 95.
[66] Oleson and Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii*, 95.
[67] Oleson and Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii*, 101.

The authors described the immediate aftermath of the overthrow as chaotic; "Fear and panic began to gain headway in the city. A riot was feared. Millions of American property, and life and order were imperilled[sic]."[68] Fear and panic, and possible rioting; could it be perhaps that the so-called "revolution" was not as popular as the authors claimed it to be? Oleson and Stevens never named the group of people they feared, but it is obvious they were referring to royalists, which primarily consisted of Kānaka ʻŌiwi who did not want any part of Oleson and Stevens' whitewashed vision of "New Hawaii".

It is important to remember the context in which *Picturesque Hawaii* was written, which is sometime between early to mid 1894, before the Provisional Government changed to the Republic of Hawaiʻi. Oleson and Stevens voiced their own disapproval of the Blount Report and President Cleveland's failure to recognize the Provisional Government. They made reference to the Morgan Report as well. The possibility of annexation was still uncertain because Cleveland was in office and America was still trying to figure out if it wanted to be imperial or not. *Picturesque Hawaii* was Oleson and Stevens' attempt at an irresistible sales pitch to persuade America to annex Hawaiʻi. They thought Hawaiʻi was "essentially American territory, lacking only the formal declaration to make it technically what it is in reality, Hawaii, U. S. A."[69] The authors likened the possible annexation of Hawaiʻi to a task no different than the acquisitions of Louisiana, Texas, or Alaska; as it was "a national necessity and a national duty."[70] At this point, Oleson and Stevens were desperately pleading the U.S. to consider annexation:

> This rich prize is now freely offered to the United States. It can not be possible that the American people and the American statesmen will refuse to accept it. To spurn and reject this important and thoroughly American colony, planted by some of the most devoted of American sons and daughters, fostered by American benevolence and sympathy, aided by a million dollars of private contributions, encouraged for more than sixty years by the American government—to abandon the people of this colony now at this crucial period of their history would be cowardice and [inhumane], which no self-respecting Christian nation will be guilty of,

[68] Oleson and Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii*, 101.
[69] Oleson and Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii*, 46. The authors echoed this sentiment in another section; "The government and those supporting it desire annexation, because they justly regard present Hawaii in reality an American colony, closely identified with American interests and governed by American ideas, American laws and American judicial rules and decisions", 107.
[70] Oleson and Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii*, 110.

> the least of all the great American nation, whose vast opportunity in the North Pacific, it would be a great want of wisdom and patriotism to ignore.[71]

The more desperately Oleson and Stevens pleaded for annexation, the clearer it became that "New Hawaii" was solely for the benefit of American settlers not Kānaka ʻŌiwi. For pro-annexationists during this time, the legitimacy of the Provisional Government was at risk. If the new government was not recognized by the United States or if the "rich prize" was not accepted, the government would be left in a state of limbo. This is was a key factor in Sanford Dole's decision to change the Provisional Government into the Republic of Hawaiʻi. The change allowed Dole and company to regroup and establish a "legitimate" government while staving off President Cleveland and anti-annexationists, biding time until America wanted Hawaiʻi.

In 1900, *Picturesque Hawaii* was re-published as *Riches and Marvels of Hawaii: A Charming Description of Her Unique History, Strange People, Exquisite Climate, Wondrous Volcanoes, Luxurious Productions, Beautiful Cities, Corrupt Monarchy, Provisional Government and Annexation*. It is no coincidence that *Riches and Marvels* was published the same year Hawaiʻi officially became a territory of the United States. Surprisingly, *Riches and Marvels* did not update readers on the political events that had transpired after the publication of *Picturesque Hawaii* in 1894. The only difference between the two books is that *Riches and Marvels* did away with the portfolio layout and larger pictures. It contains the exact same text and photos (although smaller) as *Picturesque Hawaii*.

In comparison to the other travel writings presented, *Picturesque Hawaii* is quite bizarre, from the combination of authors to the heavy political commentary. As previously stated, this is the most explicit and blatant example of the intersection between travel literature and the rationalization of American imperialism. It is a text written by one of the primary orchestrators of the 1893 overthrow, it does not get any more direct than this. To Oleson and Stevens, "Picturesque" Hawaiʻi was not the real product for sale, it was the imaginings of a "New Hawaii" that they were marketing to the American audience.

[71] Oleson and Stevens, *Picturesque Hawaii*, 110.

The Tourists' Guide Through the Hawaiian Islands by Henry M. Whitney (1895)

As stated in the previous chapter, Henry Whitney was a missionary descendent who became a well known publisher in the Hawaiian Kingdom. Although originally supportive of the monarchy in his earlier years, by the 1880s he was openly critical of the monarchy in his various publications and supported American annexation. During these years he worked closely with Lorrin Thurston in the burgeoning travel industry in order to create a "white republic".[72] Whitney's *The Tourists' Guide Through the Hawaiian Islands* was the second guidebook that he published.

The narrative of popularity is most dominant in *The Tourists' Guide*. This narrative is perhaps the most damaging because it was a conspicuous and deliberate revision of history that supported American control. In tandem with the narrative of popularity, Whitney deployed the narrative of progress as well. Throughout the course of the publication, Whitney re-told the histories of the 1893 overthrow, the formation of the Republic, and Wilcox's rebellion. In his re-telling of the overthrow, because Lili'uokalani's proposed constitution "disfranchised many foreigners, and materially changed the organic laws of the Kingdom", she was "deposed by a popular uprising".[73] Again, this so-called "popular uprising" was really just the Committee of Safety and its supporters; there was nothing popular about the nature of the overthrow. Invoking the narrative of progress, he rejoiced, "History cannot point to a more meritorious, righteous or timely change of government *from worse to better*, than the Hawaiian *revolution* of 1893."[74]

Ironically, when the Republic of Hawai'i was established in 1894, the Republican government created a new constitution in order to legitimize its rule. The 1894 Constitution restructured the government and granted the presidency to Sanford Dole. It also allowed people to elect representatives by popular vote; however, voters had to swear allegiance to the new Republic.[75] Whitney described this voting process as "the inherent revolutionary *right of the people* to choose its own government and it has proved its right to exist."[76] This new rule specifically excluded Kānaka royalists who would never betray the monarchy. Any literate

---

[72] Skwiot, 36.
[73] Henry M. Whitney, *The Tourists' Guide Through the Hawaiian Islands*, (Honolulu: The Hawaiian Gazette's Company Press, 1895), 12.
[74] Whitney, *The Tourists' Guide Through the Hawaiian Islands*, 13. Italicization my own.
[75] Whitney, *The Tourists' Guide Through the Hawaiian Islands*, 13. The Constitution was put into effect on July 4, 1894. The new Legislature of the Republic was made up of a senate and house of representatives. Each had fifteen members elected by voters. Senators served six years and representatives served for two years.
[76] Whitney, *The Tourists' Guide Through the Hawaiian Islands*, 16. Italicization my own.

European or American male, over 20, who had resided in Hawai‘i at least “from one to three years”, was eligible to vote.[77] Of course, Chinese and Japanese immigrants were still not allowed to vote. These voting restrictions created a voting population comprised of Euro-Americans who would only elect other Euro-Americans. Whitney praised the Republic for changing Hawai‘i’s government from “a course characterized by *incompetency, corruption and stagnation* to one of *ability, honesty and progress.*”[78]

Towards the ending of *The Tourists’ Guide*, Whitney re-told the events of Wilcox’s rebellion. He framed the rebellion as an example of the Republic’s citizen militia success in quelling the rebel force. In contrast, the royalists did not see the rebellion as a failure, and Wilcox was celebrated. Whitney assured readers of the future security and progression of the Republic. The Republic’s militia was always ready “at a moment’s call, to rise in defense of the public peace, and above all in defense of the Flag of Hawaii, the youngest of the world’s republics.”[79] The Republic was “established solely for maintain peace, security and the honest administration of public affairs. It seeks only the prosperity of Hawaii, regardless of race or color, nationality or creed.”[80] Here, all three narrative P’s were utilized. Progression was established and perpetuated in the “prosperity of Hawaii”. Second, popularity was expressed through the inclusion of all people, which was outright lie because of the exclusion of Chinese, Japanese, Kānaka royalists, and women. Third, protection was secured for all people as well. In this case, it was the protection of Euro-Americans from Kānaka ‘Ōiwi resistance.

The narrative of progress is also clear in J.A. Zahm’s essay, “The Destiny of Hawaii”, which Whitney included in *The Tourists’ Guide*.[81] Zahm explained that “American capital and American enterprise” were solely responsibly for Hawai‘i’s prosperity; and that Americans “still continue to have the greatest interest vested here, practically controlling, if not actually owning, the kingdom.”[82] Thus, he concluded, the “Hawaiian Islands are destined at no distant day to become the prized tropical gardens of the western portion of our great and growing

[77] Whitney, *The Tourists’ Guide Through the Hawaiian Islands*, 140. Whitney wrote, “The number of native voters in each year is decreasing, while that of foreigners is increasing.”
[78] Whitney, *The Tourists’ Guide Through the Hawaiian Islands*, 16. Italicization my own.
[79] Whitney, *The Tourists’ Guide Through the Hawaiian Islands*, 168.
[80] Whitney, *The Tourists’ Guide Through the Hawaiian Islands*, 167-168.
[81] J. A. Zahm (1851-1921) was an internationally known Catholic priest, scientist, and writer. He also befriended Theodore Roosevelt and traveled with him to South America. “Famous Priest Dies Following Short Illness,” *South Bend News-Times*, (South Bend: Indiana), November 12, 1921.
[82] Whitney, *The Tourists’ Guide Through the Hawaiian Islands*, 176.

commonwealth."[83] In Zahm's essay, it was the economic progress and American control that rationalized a possible annexation of Hawai'i in the near future.

Frances Stuart Parker: Reminiscences and Letters by Frances Stuart Parker (1907)

Frances Stuart Parker (1847-1899) visited the Hawaiian Islands during the summer of 1898. Frances and her husband, Colonel Francis Wayland "F. W." Parker, were educators at the Cook County Normal School in Chicago and were quite famous across the United States. In late 1897, the Republic of Hawai'i successfully courted the Parkers to conduct a series of lectures for the Republic's summer school session of 1898.[84] While Frances Parker stayed in the islands she wrote a series of letters that were published posthumously in 1907 as *Frances Stuart Parker: Reminiscences and Letters.*[85] This book operates not only as a biography of Frances Stuart Parker but also a collection of her travel writing.

Frances Stuart Parker's letters from Hawai'i are intriguing because she and her husband arrived in July 1898, the same time that Hawai'i was "annexed". July 1898 also happened to be the very end of the Spanish-American War. When Parker arrived in Honolulu, she was greeted by American soldiers, military vessels, and the American flag. She described this sight as an emotional experience and wrote, "The war, for the first time, has come straight home to me."[86]

Throughout her stay in the Hawaiian Islands, Parker primarily interacted with the upper class haole families, such as the Doles, Dillinghams, Judds, Thurstons, and Castles.[87] The first

[83] Whitney, *The Tourists' Guide Through the Hawaiian Islands*, 176.
[84] "Famous Teachers," *The Pacific Commercial Advertiser,* (Honolulu, Hawai'i), December 18, 1897. This article explains that the Parkers turned down a multitude of teaching offers in order to fulfill their desire to visit Hawai'i. See also "A Strong Course," *The Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, (Honolulu, Hawai'i) December 22, 1897.
[85] Frances Stuart Parker's letters were most likely written to one of her daughters. In her letters, she referred to her husband, Colonel Parker, as "Father". The "reminiscences" in the book celebrate her life story and include many contributions from her friends and family. Parker grew up in the middle-upper class of New England.
[86] Frances Stuart Parker, *Frances Stuart Parker: Reminiscences and Letters,* (Chicago: privately printed, 1907), 65.
[87] Benjamin Franklin Dillingham (1844-1918) and his son, Walter F. Dillingham (1875-1963), are most famous for their magnitude of industrial power that they established in Hawai'i. The elder Dillingham created the Oahu Railway, which helped transport sugar and passengers across the island. Walter Dillingham transformed Waikīkī by dredging its wetlanda and creating the Ala Wai Canal. The Judds were a well-established missionary descended family. Its most famous members are Gerrit P. Judd (1803-1873) , George Robert Carter (1866-1933), Lawrence M. Judd (1887-1968). Gerrit Judd was missionary who later become an advisor to Kauikeaouli. His grandson George Carter succeeded Sanford Dole as governor of the Territory (1903-1907). Lawrence Judd, another grandson, was governor from 1929-1934. Like the Judds, the Castles were also a missionary descended family. The Castles were heavily ingrained in the politics and economy (such as the company Castle & Cooke) of Hawai'i. All these elite families were inter-connected through marriage, politics, and business.

mention of Sanford Dole is when she wrote about the breaking news of annexation that came to Hawai‘i. A steamship from the U.S. arrived at the wharf adorned with American flags and signaled that the American annexation of Hawai‘i had been completed. She and Colonel Parker went down to the ocean to see the celebration; she happily exclaimed, “President Dole was just in front of us, on his horse. He and Father shook hands and exchanged congratulations. He rode back and greeted me as a fellow citizen.”[88]

In another part of her stay, Parker visited the Kamehameha School for Girls. The students hosted and performed for Parker and the other guests. After listening to the girls sing, Parker expressed, “They are intensely loyal, and the Queen is expected back next week; so they are greatly aroused. The native Hawaiian feels very bad over annexation.”[89] This is the first instance where Parker acknowledged that there was any type of Kānaka ‘Ōiwi opposition to annexation.

The second instance is when Parker attended the infamous flag ceremony on August 12, 1898. On this day, the Hae Hawai‘i (Hawaiian flag) was removed from the government building and replaced with the American flag. According to Parker, as the flags were swapped, a rousing cheer broke out but quickly quieted down, “for every one respects the feelings of the natives.”[90] The flag ceremony was a symbolic event for all the citizens of Hawai‘i, both royalists and pro-annexationists.

The removal of the hae Hawai‘i was a visual representation of the closing of the Hawaiian Kingdom. A month before the flag ceremony, the nūpepa *Ke Aloha Aina* published an article titled “Ka Hae Hawai‘i”. The unknown writer lamented that the Hae Hawai‘i had become a “mea pakaukau…o ka poe e ake nei e pakaukau i ka hae aloha o ko kakou aina kulaiwi…” (an item for sale…of the people who desire to sell the beloved flag of our homeland).[91] Towards the end of the column, the author expressed the emotional sentiment toward the Hawaiian flag:

> He mea nui keia ia makou, oiai makou e ku ana a nana aku i na hana hoomaewaewa a ko kakou mau hoaloha, ma ka hoohui ana ae i ka hae Amerika me ka hae Hawaii i hookahi. O ka kakou ike ana aku i ka hae nani o Hawaii e owili pu ia ana iloko o kekahi kulana okoa, he mea e ka ehaeha o ka naau…

[88] Parker, 69.
[89] Parker, 72.
[90] Parker, 96.
[91] “Ka Hae Hawaii,” *Ke Aloha Aina*, (Honolulu: Hawai‘i), 9 July 1898.

> He oiaio, o na kanaka Hawaii a pau i ikemaka i keia mau hana imua o ko lakou maka, eha ko lakou kino, a kona walania hoi ko lakou mau iwihilo…[92]
>
> This is an important thing to us, while we stand and watch the abusive acts of our acquaintances, in the unification of the the American flag with the Hawaiian flag as one. We see the beloved flag of Hawai'i waving at a different rank, it is something that agonizes the na'au [heart or soul, one's inner being]...
>
> This is the truth, all of the Hawaiian people have seen these actions before their own eyes, their bodies ache, painfully throbbing to the core of their being...

Another example of sentiment can be found in the open letter written by a citizen named Edward Kekoa, titled "He Kanaka Hawaii Ana Anei Ka Mea Nana E Huki Ka Hae Hawaii Ilalo."[93] According to Kekoa, there were rumors that several Kānaka had been invited to pull the flag down at the August 12th ceremony. In response to these rumors, Kekoa said that any Kānaka who accepted the invitation would be a traitor. He further explained, "E waiho aku no na ka haole Amerika a welo Amerika hoi, e hana i ua hana la, i kau iho no ka hope oia hana i ka haole, aole i ke kanaka Hawaii" (Leave it for the American haole and American progeny to do this task, thus the consequences of the task will be placed on the haole, not the Hawaiian people).[94]

The aforementioned newspaper articles are just two examples of the many articles that illustrate the symbolic meaning of the Hawaiian flag. Although Frances Stuart Parker noted that the people at the August 12th ceremony were respectful, Parker did not fully understand the magnitude of annexation from the royalist perspective. Throughout her letters she came across as slightly sympathetic, but never empathetic. It was clear that Parker recognized how she personally benefitted from annexation; after a shopping trip, she happily exclaimed, "Isn't it lucky we are to be in the U.S. Now I can take things home."[95] Previously established taxes on the

---

[92] "Ka Hae Hawaii," *Ke Aloha Aina*, (Honolulu: Hawai'i), 9 July 1898. The term "iwihilo" at the end of the quotation literally means the femur bone. However, the iwihilo also metaphorically refers to the core of one's being.
[93] "He Kanaka Hawaii Ana Anei Ka Mea Nana E Huki Ka Hae Hawaii Ilalo," *Ke Aloha Aina*, (Honolulu: Hawai'i) 13 August 1898. The title literally asked: would a Hawaiian be the one to pull the Hawaiian flag down? Kekoa's letter was published the day after the flag ceremony, however, *Ke Aloha Aina* was a weekly newspaper, thus, the letter was written prior to the flag ceremony. Also, *Ke Aloha Aina* was a royalist newspaper edited by Emma Nāwahī, who was a part of Hui Aloha 'Āina.
[94] "He Kanaka Hawaii Ana Anei Ka Mea Nana E Huki Ka Hae Hawaii Ilalo," *Ke Aloha Aina*, (Honolulu: Hawai'i) 13 August 1898. The most interesting part of Kekoa's letter is that he also invoked the story of Judas Iscariot's betrayal of Jesus as a metaphor for the (possible) betrayal of the Hawaiian flag by a fellow Hawaiian. Kekoa told readers to remember that the consequence of the betrayal fell solely on Judas, not the Jewish priests who persuaded and paid him.
[95] Parker, 77

transport of goods no longer applied because Hawai‘i had become “our new possessions”, as Parker later explained.[96]

In regards to race, unlike other writers, Parker did not use an excessive amount of negative language towards Native Hawaiians. She used “primitive” to describe Hawaiian music; and during her visit to the Bishop Museum she described the exhibits (most likely in the Pacific collection) as fine work created by the “lowest of savages” and “cannibals”.[97] In these two examples, Parker is actually not speaking directly about Native Hawaiians of 1898. In her single general description found in her letters, she wrote, “The Hawaiians are a fine people, gracious in manner, kind, and of *splendid development*.”[98] This is an important statement in understanding where Parker placed Kānaka in the racial hierarchy of Hawai‘i and America. She viewed the Kānaka living in 1898 as a symbol of progress in contrast to those of the past; which meant that they were civilized and fit to be American citizens (but still not equal to white Americans).

The most interesting scene in Parker’s letters is her experience on the island of Maui, where she observed men transporting cattle from land to ship. The cattle were dragged into the shallow water, roped and strapped down to a small flat boat, and then taken further out into the water to meet a larger steamship that went to Honolulu. At this time, there were no wharves or piers on Maui, which is why this laborious process was necessary. Parker was absolutely appalled at what she saw and she described the process as a “disgrace” and a “cruelty to animals”. She adamantly concluded, “I tell you under the new order of things [post-annexation] that won’t long continue. *What won’t men do for money?*”[99] Considering that Parker had just mingled with the likes of Sanford Dole, Benjamin and Walter Dillingham, Lorrin Thurston, and James Castle, this statement is incredibly ironic. All these men had either direct or indirect roles in the 1893 overthrow and the push for annexation leading up to 1898; they had a great political or economic stake to gain in the end of the Hawaiian Kingdom. Parker was so blinded by her position as a white American, that she does not even realize what she just described.

[96] Parker, 80.
[97] Parker, 71, 86.
[98] Parker, 90. Italicization my own.
[99] Parker, 101-102. Italicization my own.

Hawaii: Its People Their Legends by Emma Nākuina (1904)

Emma Kailikapuolono Metcalf Beckley Nākuina (1847-1929) is one of the most intriguing, and perhaps underappreciated figures in Hawaiian history. At different points in her life, Nākuina was a lady-in-waiting in the royal court, a curator, scholar, writer, judge, teacher, humanitarian, and of course, a travel writer. Emma's mother was Kailikapuolono, an aliʻi from the ʻāina of Kūkaniloko, Oʻahu; her father was Theophilus Metcalf, a well known photographer.[100] Emma Nākuina was considered to be the foremost expert of all things Hawaiian during her life.

In 1902, the Territorial Government created the Hawaii Promotion Committee (H.P.C.) in order to officially promote Hawaiʻi. The H.P.C. commissioned and published Nākuina's guide book, *Hawaii, Its People, Their Legends*, making her the first Kānaka ʻŌiwi to publish a guide book of Hawaiʻi. Nākuina's publication greatly contrasted against the Euro-American produced travel writings. As evident in the title, *Hawaii, Its People, Their Legends*, Nākuina prioritized the moʻolelo of her ancestors and of the ʻāina while criticizing Euro-Americans.[101] Nākuina wrote that, "every nook, cliff, valley or plain, as well as strip of coast, headland or stretch of water, had its story or legend formerly."[102] Moʻolelo could explain why certain natural features (such as rock formations or a types of winds) are found in specific ʻāina. These moʻolelo and place names alluded to historical events and ancestral figures.

In the introduction titled "The Hawaiian People", Nākuina celebrated the expertise of Kānaka as historians, genealogists, athletes, agriculturalists, fishermen, and poets. She used the example of traditional fishing regulations to make her point. Kapu (regulations) on ocean resources controlled the harvesting of certain types of creatures during certain seasons. This allowed for sustainable harvesting and avoided interference with spawning cycles. Aliʻi and makaʻāinana (common citizens) were both responsible in upholding kapu in order to preserve

[100] Emma was married twice; her first husband was Frederick Beckley (m. 1867) and her second was Moses Nākuina (m. 1887). Beckley was descended from George Beckley; a sea captain who became close to Kamehameha I and eventually married an aliʻi. Frederick Beckley was the governor of Kauaʻi when he passed away in 1881. Emma's son F.W. Beckley became a noted politician. Her second husband, Moses Nākuina, was and is well known as a scholar and publisher. His most famous publication is *Moolelo Hawaii o Pakaa a me Ku-a-Pakaa, na Kahu Iwikuamoo o Keawenuiaumi, ke Alii o Hawaii, a o na Mopuna hoi o Laamaomao*, which was translated and republished in as *The Wind Gourd of Laʻamaomao*.

[101] Emma Metcalf Nākuina, *Hawaii: Its People Their Legends*, (Honolulu: Hawaii Promotion Committee, 1904), 16. The moʻolelo in Nākuina's publication are: *The Great Battle of Nuuanu, Pele Goddess of Volcano, Pele and Lohiau, The Valley of the Rainbows*, *Legend of Kaliuwaa, Kaopulupulu and a Prophecy, Kaululaau and Lanai, Defeat of the Alapa, Kamehameha's Last Heiau,* and *Kealakekua Bay: Capt. Cook.*

[102] Nākuina, 16.

resources. Nākuina chastised, "the white man, with his alleged superior knowledge" for convincing some of the chiefs and commoners to forgo kapu, thus, affecting the overall health of natural resources.[103] Nākuina criticized changes in Hawaiian life due to the "white man's standard of civilization" and the diseases and vices brought by foreigners.[104] She challenged the idea that Euro-Americans introduced progress to Kānaka because she asserted that Kānaka were already experts in many things; thus, why would they need protection?

In *Hawaii: Its People, Their Legends,* Nākuina used moʻolelo as platform for political commentry, as in the moʻolelo of *Kaopulupulu*.[105] This moʻolelo took place in Waimea Valley Oʻahu, the residence of Kaopulupulu. In the moʻolelo, Kahekili, aliʻi nui of Maui, and Kahahana, aliʻi nui of Oʻahu, plotted to kill Kaopulupulu; however, Kaopulupulu heard of the plot and devised a plan. He did not want to his people to be killed, so he fled with his family in order to draw the enemy forces away from Waimea. However, Kaopulupulu and his family were intercepted and attacked. As Kaopulupulu was dying, he called out to his injured son and told him to go into the sea and die there. His son made it into the ocean and perished.

Nākuina explained that Kaopulupulu's command that his son to go into ocean was a widely accepted prophecy that Oʻahu's sovereignty would be usurped by an overseas power. Kahekili of Maui defeated and killed Kahahana; later Kamehameha from Hawaiʻi Island conquered Oʻahu as well. Nākuina saw annexation as an extension of this prophecy; in fact, she questioned whether American control was temporary and would eventually be succeeded by another power. Thus, as Bacchilega explained, Nākuina's "long view makes the American annexation of Hawaiʻi like the other takeovers—transient, or reversible."[106]

The hope that American control would be ephemeral was an idea that was held onto dearly by Kānaka ʻŌiwi and other royalists throughout the post-overthrow period. In an 1894 nūpepa article titled "O Ka Manu Phoenix Ko Ka Lahui Hawaii Hoalike" (*Ka Oiaio*, 10 Aug. 1894), the editor compared the Lāhui Hawaiʻi (the nation) to the legendary phoenix of Egypt. The phoenix lived in 500 year life cycles. At the end of each cycle, the old bird would fly into a fire set atop an altar and be consumed by the flames. Within three days, a new phoenix would rise from the ashes, exceeding the beauty of its predecessor, and live for another 500 years. The

[103] Nākuina, 11-12.
[104] Nākuina, 14.
[105] Nākuina, 52-53.
[106] Bacchilega, 131.

editor stated that the re-birth of the phoenix was relatable to the current state of the lāhui as well as the future:

> Mai ka lehu mai kona ola hou ana a lilo i mea oi aku ka nani i ko ka wa mamua aku, ua hoinoia ka Lahui Hawaii, ua hoopauia kona noho aupuni Moi ana, a ua puhiia oia e ka poe kumakaia, a me he la ua lilo i mea ole, i lehu hoi mahope o kona hoopauia ana, ua olelo na poe hookahuli aupuni, ua pau ke ku hou ana o ke aupuni Moi o Hawaii. Aole oia e ike hou ia. Aka, ano, ke oni mai la o Hawaii iloko o ka lehu ahi, me he enuhe liilii la a me mu la, a i ke ekolu o ka la, e hoea mai auanei oia me kona nani hiwahiwa luaole, e like me ka nani o ka manu Phoenix, a e hoomauia kona noho aupuni ana no elima haneri makahiki hou aku e like me mamua aku o kona noho aupuni ana mai kahiko loa mai.[107]
>
> Its new life comes from the ashes and becomes something more beautiful than its past. The Lāhui Hawaii has been harmed, the monarchy has been ended, and it has been burned by the traitors, as if it has become nothing, to ashes after its destruction. The overthrowers said, the reign of the monarchy of Hawai‘i is over. It will not be known again. But [in awe] Hawai‘i stirs in the fiery ashes, as if it were a caterpillar or worm, and on the third day, it just appears with its incomparable esteemed glory, just like the beauty of the phoenix, and the reign is continued for another 500 years like the past reigns of long ago.[108]

Similar to the mo‘olelo of Kaopulupulu, this article from *Ka Oiaio* viewed the political events as something that could be over-turned, as if it were just a part of a natural cycle. Both the mo‘olelo of Kaopulupulu and the metaphor of the phoenix are also words of patience; that change would not come immediately, it would take time. In the other examples of travel writings, writers considered American control as final and irreversible.

Reading against the grain is valuable in understanding *Hawaii: Its People Their Legends*. It is important to remember the conditions under which Nākuina's writing was published. As the promotional arm of the colonial government, the Hawaii Promotion Committee was invested in attracting foreigners to an American Hawai‘i. In *The Cambridge Introduction to Travel Writing*, Tim Youngs stated that travel writings which were considered "radical in their politics", or unconventional in form, were usually unpopular.[109] In comparison to the examples in this chapter, Emma Nākuina's *Hawaii: Its People Their Legends* was a large step outside the prescribed structure and content of travel writing, guide books in particular.

[107] "O Ka Manu Phoenix Ko Ka Lahui Hawaii Hoalike," *Ka Oiaio*, (Honolulu, Hawai‘i), 10 August 1894.
[108] Translation my own.
[109] Youngs, 175.

It is truly unclear on how *Hawaii: Its People Their Legends* was received by its audience. According to an article in *The Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, the H.P.C. printed 25,000 copies of the book at a total cost of $1161. This is a relatively small amount considering that the article noted that the H.P.C. also printed 250,000 copies of another guidebook (*Hawaii*) for $4400.[110] In one example of feedback, the newspaper *The Hawaiian Star* reported that the Secretary of the Connecticut Board of Education, Charles D. Hine, had requested ten additional copies of *Hawaii: Its People Their Legends* to be sent to Connecticut school libraries.[111] Clearly Hine saw some sort of educational value in Nākuina's work but many questions are left unanswered. Did readers (including the H.P.C.) take Nākuina's social and political commentary seriously? Or did they just see her as a token Hawaiian "informant"? *Hawaii: Its People Their Legends* was never re-printed nor was Nākuina ever commissioned to write another guidebook for the H.P.C.

One could speculate on the reasons why Nākuina did not return to travel writing. However, there seemed to be no malice between Emma Nākuina and the H.P.C., as Nākuina continued to support the H.P.C. and the travel industry. In 1906, *The Hawaiian Gazette* published a letter from Nākuina to businessman and photographer Alonzo Gartley[112], in which Nākuina offered to sell a portion of her Kalihi property (around Gulick and King St.) in order to build a Japanese and Hawaiian village for tourists. Nākuina said that this village attraction had been proposed in previous newspaper issues but she possessed the land necessary to build such an attraction. She also suggested that the H.P.C. buy a large lot on Kaili St. and turn it into a neighborhood park to further develop the Kalihi area.[113]

A lengthy 1913 article in *The Honolulu Star-Bulletin* explained that Emma Nākuina wanted to vastly improve the tour system for visitors. She went before the Hawaii Promotion Committee and told them that the tours were insufficient and the tour guides were incompetent. Her idea was to be employed by the H.P.C. in order to teach and train a new crop of tour guides, specifically female tour guides. The new tour would be executed through a predetermined route—over the Pali, along the east-northeast of Oʻahu, and back through Haleʻiwa. The article

[110] "Merchants Indorse The Promotion Committee,"*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), October 15, 1904.
[111] "Libraries Use Hawaiian Ad," *The Hawaiian Star*, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), April 1, 1904.
[112] Alonzo Gartley settled in Hawaiʻi in 1900 and worked for Hawaiian Electric Co. and C. Brewer, becoming a prominent member of the business and industrial community. His connection to the travel industry was through his highly praised photography which was used in various promotions. "Gartley Hall", University of Hawaiʻi Mānoa, website, accessed July 2016.
[113] "Jap and Hawaiian Villages," *The Hawaiian Gazette*, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi) February 9, 1906.

stated that during the presentation to the H.P.C., Nākuina "pointed out places of interest which are little heard of or more less visited." Although the H.P.C. was in favor of Nākuina's proposal they did not have the money to fund the project, instead they suggested that Nākuina seek private funding.[114]

Both articles show that Nākuina realized that the travel industry was going to be new and unavoidable economy. The second newspaper article stands out, as Emma was trying find a position within the industry, particularly in the presentation of Hawaiian history to visitors. The driving question for Nākuina was "If not us (Kānaka), then who?" At the time, she was probably one of the very few, if not the only Kānaka ʻŌiwi, who had any amount of influence in travel promotion and who regularly had the ear of the Committee. If Emma Nākuina did not try to be involved, then who else could have? The guide book *Hawaii: Its People Their Legends* and the proposal to re-vamp the tour system allowed Emma to negotiate and reclaim the production of Hawaiian history and culture on her own terms.

Emma Nākuina is one of the most overlooked Kānaka ʻŌiwi scholars of the past, if not one of the most underappreciated figures in all of Hawaiian history. For all of her accomplishments, contributions, and social activism in Hawaiʻi, she is overshadowed by household names like Kamakau and Malo and Pukuʻi, and continues to go unrecognized.[115] Additionally, some of her research was credited towards other scholars such as when she worked with W.D. Alexander. Nākuina would receive publication credit only as an assisstant or collaborator, not as an equal. In *Legendary Hawaiʻi*, Cristina Bacchilega stated that Nākuina "was recognized as knowledgeable---but in a subordinate way."[116] It was not just because Nākuina was Native Hawaiian, it was also because she was a female.

Emma was looked upon as one of the foremost authorities on Hawaiian history and culture in the late 19th and early 20th century. One would think that she would have been a guaranteed member of the Hawaiian Historical Society upon its inception in 1892, but this was not the case. In fact there were no women in the HHS until 1894, when Emma and famed Tahitian scholar Teuira Henry were finally inducted as "corresponding members". The

[114] "Promoters Are Recipients of Most Novel Idea," *The Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), September 26, 1913.
[115] Several newspaper articles highlight Nākuina's humanitarian efforts on Oʻahu: Emma Nākuina, "The Women's Relief Society," *Hawaiian Gazette*, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), 10 September 1895. Also "Ladies' Relief Society," *Evening Bulletin,* (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), 27 September 1895. And "The Hawaiian Relief Society," *Evening Bulletin,* (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), 11 November 1895. "The Aala Park," *The Independent*, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), 9 October 1896.
[116] Bacchilega, 113.

corresponding members list consisted of people who lived abroad and were not considered to be "active members". Emma and Teuira (and another person) were the only corresponding members that lived in Hawai'i.[117] Both women were regarded as experts in their respective fields but were not treated as equals.

Hawaii: Its People Their Legends was just one part of Emma Nākuina's busy life and career. It may not have been the most important accomplishment her life, but it is a text that is vital to the understanding of travel writing during that era of history. Nākuina passed away on April 27, 1929 at the age of 81. In her obituary published in the nūpepa *Ke Alakai O Hawaii*, Emma was described as a motherly figure who, in her younger days, could be relied on to complete any multitude of tasks; it was not until she became sick that she was unable to do the things she wanted to do.[118]

Addressing "Pilikias": Progress, Protection, and Popularity

In 1898, retired Rear Admiral, L.A. Beardslee wrote an article titled "Pilikias" published in *The North American Review.* He referred to royalist Kānaka 'Ōiwi as "pilikias" because they supported Lili'u and openly resisted annexation. Although annexation was already secured, "If we can obtain their consent to be governed by us", Beardslee explained, "the problem is solved."[119] Beardslee cited reports of Kānaka 'Ōiwi resistance at the August 12th flag ceremony; the same ceremony that Frances Stuart Parker attended. No Kānaka royalists took part in the ceremony and the highest ranking ali'i (Lili'uokalani, Kapi'olani, and Ka'iulani) were absent.[120] The "Hawaiian damsels" who were supposed to take the Hae Hawai'i down, refused to do so (Edward Kekoa must have been proud); while the band would not play "Hawai'i Pono'ī", the Kingdom anthem.[121] Beardslee suggested that Lili'u, who had "the ear and love of her countrymen", ask her supporters to accept the fate of Hawai'i, then that "pilikia would be *pau* (finished)."[122]

[117] *Third Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society*, (Honolulu, Hawai'i, 1895), 20.
[118] "Hala Ia Kamaaina Kahiko O Honolulu Nei," *Ke Alakai O Hawaii*, (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 2 Mei 1929.
[119] L. A. Beardslee, "Pilikias", *The North American Review* 167, no. 503, (1898), 475.
[120] Kapi'olani was the wife of Kalākaua. Ka'iulani was Lili'u's neice, and would have been her successor.
[121] Beardslee, 475.
[122] Beardslee, 479.

Numerous example of pilikia have been introduced throughout this chapter. For royalists, the loss of sovereignty; and for annexationists, the resistance by Kānaka ʻŌiwi. These samples of travel writings (Stoddard, Oleson and Stevens, Whitney, and Parker) rationalized the Euro-American control of Hawaiʻi by the deployment of the three narratives P's: popularity, protection, and progress. These three narratives censured the resistance efforts of Native Hawaiian royalists, while perpetuating the idea that Hawaiʻi was secure and stable, such as Oleson and Stevens' imagining of a "New Hawaii". As Christine Skwiot argued, "All empires enact and legitimize colonial conquest through ritual and performance as well as violence and decree. Agents of U.S. empire sought to create the appearances, if not necessarily the conditions, that enabled the naturalization of forcible conquests as consensual acts."[123] It is important to re-think and address how the subversive rationalizations of imperialistic acts have affected Hawaiian history, rather than to bury the pilikia in the "Imagined Hawaiʻi".

[123] Skwiot, 1.

-Ch. 4-
Hele Aku, Hoʻi Mai: Re-visiting Moʻolelo Huakaʻi

I hoʻokauhua i ke kōlea, no Kahiki ana ke keiki.
When there is a desire for plovers, the child-to-be will travel to Kahiki.
Said of a pregnant woman. If she craves plovers, her child will someday travel to foreign lands. (ON1167)
-*ʻŌlelo Noʻeau: Hawaiian Proverbs and Poetical Sayings.*

In *The Cambridge Introduction to Travel Writing*, Tim Youngs argued that, "The language of exploration history perpetuates the idea of active, inquiring Europeans and static, passive indigenes."[1] This is important in the popular envisioning of Hawaiʻi and Native Hawaiians as a place and people that are geographically isolated; small islands and peoples in the middle of a vast ocean. In the well known Pacific Island Studies articles "Our Sea of Islands" (1993), scholar Epeli Hauʻofa rebutted against this perception of "isolation":

> But if we look at the myths, legends and oral traditions of the peoples of Oceania, it will become evident that they did not conceive of their world in such microscopic proportions. Their universe comprised not only land surfaces, but the surrounding ocean as far as they could traverse and exploit it, the underworld with its fire-controlling and earth-shaking denizens, and the heavens above with their hierarchies and powerful gods and named stars and constellations that people could count on and guide their way across the seas. Their world was anything but tiny. They thought big and recounted their deeds in epic proportions.[2]

Hauʻofa suggested that instead of thinking of Oceania as small islands in a large sea; to re-think Oceania as a "sea of islands". The ocean is not a barrier that cuts off islands, cultures, and people from one another; rather it is a waterway that connects and bridges Oceania.

The voyages, travels, and adventures of Kānaka ʻŌiwi throughout time are a critical part of Hawaiian history. The numerous movements of akua, aliʻi, and makaʻāinana are recorded in both oral and written traditions: migrations, diplomatic missions, diaspora, leisure, etc. In this chapter, I chose to re-visit these moʻolelo huakaʻi (travel accounts) because they are an often overlooked area of discourse. These accounts describe how and why Kānaka ʻŌiwi traveled, and

[1] Youngs, 37.
[2] Epeli Hauʻofa, "Our Sea of Islands," in *A New Oceania: Rediscovering Our Sea of Islands*, edited by Vijay Naidu, Eric Waddell, and Epeli Hauʻofa, (Suva: School of Social and Economic Development, The University of the South Pacific, 1993), 7.

how their travels contributed to the formation of the Hawaiian Kingdom, from early migrations to 19th century travels. Additionally, Native Hawaiian travel had both direct and indirect effects on the experiences of the European and American travelers who came to Hawai‘i. For example, travel writers like William Root Bliss, W. B. Oleson, and John L. Stevens, were critical of the anti-American, pro-British policies of mō‘ī Alexander Liholiho and Lota Kapuāiwa. However, the reign of the two sibling mō‘ī were shaped by their shared experiences of racism while abroad in the United States.

In the first part of the chapter, I review the accounts of cross-migrations between Hawai‘i and Kahiki found in Samuel M. Kamakau's nūpepa series *Ka Moolelo Hawaii*. These mo‘olelo show that after the Hawaiian Islands were settled, Kānaka ‘Ōiwi continued to make voyages to lands far away, coming into contact with foreigners long before the infamous arrival of Capt. Cook. Some of these voyages were purely exploratory, while others had political purposes such as re-establishing chiefly lineages. One of the most beloved mo‘olelo huaka‘i is *Hi‘iakaikapoliopele*. The first part of this mo‘olelo chronicles Pele's migration from Kahiki to Hawai‘i, while the main part tells the story of Hi‘iaka's circuit of the islands. The account of Pele's travel is important because her migration records some of the geological formations of the Hawaiian archipelago. Hi‘iaka's circuit of the Hawaiian Islands presents complex interactions with not only people, but ‘āina as well. Additionally, both Pele and Hi‘iaka assume the role of malihini (foreigners) in their travel to and through Hawai‘i. For this discussion of the huaka‘i of Pele and Hi‘iaka, I draw upon ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui's analysis of *Hi‘iakaikapoliopele* in her text *Voices of Fire: Reweaving the Literary Lei of Pele and Hi‘iaka.*

In the second half of the chapter, I focus on the huaka‘i taken by ali‘i throughout the islands and around the world. I start with the diplomatic missions of 1842 and 1849, where each diplomatic party encountered racism in America. Witnessing racism firsthand informed the way the individuals saw themselves in relation to the Kingdom and in relation to America. I then move to the span between 1874-1882, which covers the political competition between mō‘ī Kalākaua and Queen Emma Kaleleonālani Rooke. Both used travel to gain political followers and to ho‘omana (empower) their respective genealogies. This span includes Kalākaua's world trip, which also helped to improve the Kingdom's foreign relations. In the final stop on the travel through history, I review Lili‘uokalani's personal account of her release from imprisonment and immediate trip to Boston in 1896. Lili‘u's travel allowed her to clear her mind and "escape" the

political turmoil going on in her homeland. Most important is how the North American landscape inspired Lili‘u to launch into an intense political commentary.

One of the limitations of this chapter is that I focus only on the accounts of akua and ali‘i. The travels of maka‘āinana are incredibly important as well. Maka‘āinana were a part of the large labor diaspora into the Pacific North West and the west coast of the United States throughout the course of the 19th century. Kānaka traveled the globe whether it was for labor, education, or leisure. The Hawaiian language nūpepa is the primary archive for many of these accounts. Kānaka ‘Ōiwi living or traveling abroad sent letters back to Hawai‘i which in turn were published in the nūpepa.

From Kahiki to Hawai‘i and Back Again-Cross Migrations and Voyaging Chiefs

The idea of “discovery” and claiming who was “first” is purely a Western imperialist ideology, such as the perpetuated narrative that Captain Cook was the “first to discover” the Hawaiian Islands, just like Columbus was the “first to discover” the Americas. Additionally, histories of Hawai‘i have always turned the attention towards the penetrative influx of foreigners post-Cook (1778), without considering the longer histories of Kānaka travel pre-Cook or that nearly all the highest ranking ali‘i post-Kamehameha I had traveled outside of Hawai‘i.

In Samuel M. Kamakau’s series of *Ka Moolelo Hawaii*, he dedicated five nūpepa articles to the mo‘olelo of Kahiki and interactions with haole (foreigners). “Kahiki” figuratively refers to any lands beyond the horizon of Hawai‘i, in Oceania or beyond. Early navigational stories about Kahiki do not claim Cook-like discovery over Hawai‘i, but rather they are about movements within Oceania and beyond, as well as histories of sustained contact with other people.

The “bigness” of the Hawaiian world is reflected in the numerous mo‘olelo of Kahiki. Kamakau explained that many Hawaiians traveled between the lands in the realm of Kahiki. Some of these Kahiki lands are Nu‘uhiva, Bolabola, ‘Upolu, Sawai‘i, ‘o Hōlanikū, Hōlanimoe, Hakukake, Lalokapu, Ku‘uku‘u, Malimali, Muliwai‘ōlena, and Ma‘okūulūu. References to these places can be found in stories, prophetic songs, and prayers. There were also mentions of lands of “kupali‘i” (small people) and “pilikua” (giants).[3]

[3] Samuel M. Kamakau, *Ke Kumu Aupuni: ka mo‘olelo Hawai‘i no Kamehameha Ka Na‘i Aupuni a me kāna aupuni i ho‘okumu ai*, (Honolulu: ‘Ahahui ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i, 1996), 28. Place names such as Nu‘uhiwa, Bolabola, ‘Upolu, and

Also important is Kamakau's distinction between two types of travelers. Those who made circuits between Kahiki and Hawai‘i were "nā kānaka maoli o Hawai‘i nei", [the true people of Hawai‘i]. He stated, "'a‘ole lākou i kapa ‘ia he āhole, a he haole", [they were not called āhole, or haole]. Āhole (or āholehole), like kōlea, is yet another metaphor for foreigner. Foreigners were compared to the āhole fish (*Kuhlia sandvicensis*) due to its white-colored scales. In the mo‘olelo of Puamakua, Paumakua is said to be "ke ali‘i i ka‘apuni iā Kahiki", [the ali‘i who traveled all around Kahiki]. When he returned to Hawai‘i, he brought back two kahuna (priests or experts) from Kahiki, ‘Auakahinu and ‘Auakamea. These haole were described as "maka ‘ālohilohi" [sparkling eyed, blue or light-brown], "ke āholehole maka ‘a‘ā" [wide eyed āholehole], and "ka pua‘a ke‘oke‘o nui maka ‘ula‘ula" [big white pigs with red eyes].[4]

In another mo‘olelo, Kūkanaloa brought two haole to Hawai‘i, Kanikawī and Kanikawā. They were named after the sacred flowers of the goddess Haumea. It was said that their voices were garbled like the lale (sacred bird) of the mountains.[5] The names of these two haole also reflect sound; wī is a shrill high-pitched sound, while wā is comparable to a roar. In these two mo‘olelo, these po‘e haole are distinguished by their physical appearance and their unintelligible speech. Although these mo‘olelo do not elaborate further on the interactions between haole and Kānaka, Kamakau said that foreigners and Hawaiians were kama‘āina with each other, and that foreigners became the ancestors to some Hawaiians (through procreation).[6]

The circuits of travel between Hawai‘i and Kahiki held major political and cultural importance, as in the mo‘olelo of Pā‘ao and the mo‘olelo of La‘amaikahiki. Pā‘ao and his brother, Lonopele, were kahuna who lived at a sea-cliff called Ka‘akōheo.[7] Lonopele accused Pā‘ao's son of stealing food, so Pā‘ao cut open his own son's stomach to prove his innocence (it was empty). Pā‘ao decided to leave their home but not before exacting revenge against Lonopele. In preparation for travel to Hawai‘i, Pā‘ao constructed a marvelous new wa‘a (canoe). Lonopele had a young son too and Pā‘ao knew that children loved touching things that they were not supposed to touch. Upon completion, Pā‘ao placed a kapu (law or rule) over the wa‘a: no one could touch the wa‘a until the kapu was lifted. Of course, Lonopele's son slapped the hulls of the

---

Sawai‘i most likely correspond to Nuku Hiva (Marquesas), Pora Pora/Bora Bora (Tahiti), Upolu (Sāmoa), and Savai‘i (Sāmoa).

[4] Kamakau, *Ke Kumu Aupuni*, 30. Translation my own.

[5] Kamakau, *Ke Kumu Aupuni*, 42.

[6] Kamakau, *Ke Kumu Aupuni*, 43.

[7] Kamakau, *Ke Kumu Aupuni*, 31. It was said Ka‘akōheo may be in Wawa‘u (Tonga), ‘Upolu (Sāmoa), or islands further south, perhaps Nūkīlani (New Zealand).

canoe; the boy was killed and his body was left under the back of the canoe. Lonopele found his son days later, the body engulfed in flies. Thus, Pā‘ao's canoe was named *Ka nalo a muia*, "the swarming of the flies".[8]

Pā‘ao left Kahiki and landed his wa‘a at Puna, Hawai‘i Island. There he built Waha‘ula heiau, then built a second heiau, Mo‘okini, in Kohala. More specifically, Mo‘okini was built at a place called ‘Upolu, perhaps sharing the name of Pā‘ao's homeland in Kahiki. Pā‘ao brought thirty-eight people on his migration from Kahiki, which included servants, kāula (prophetic seers), and ali‘i. The most famous of these ali‘i was Pilika‘aiea (Pili). Pā‘ao installed Pili as the ruling ali‘i of Hawai‘i Island, and Pā‘ao served as his kahuna.

This was a major development for Hawai‘i Island, as Kamakau explained the larger context of Pā‘ao's voyage: "Ua ‘ōlelo ‘ia, ua nele ‘o Hawai‘i i ke ali‘i ‘ole, no laila [i] ki‘i ‘ia ai ke ali‘i i Kahiki", [It was said, Hawai‘i was without chiefs, therefore ali‘i were brought from Kahiki].[9] At the time, all the ali‘i of Hawai‘i Island were actually commoners, or they were ali‘i who were not genealogically tied to Hawai‘i Island (from Maui, Moloka‘i, or O‘ahu). For 800 years, Hawai‘i Island was ruled in this fashion.[10] Kamakau added, "‘o ia [ke] kumu no ka ‘imi ‘ana i ke ali‘i i Kahiki, a pēlā paha i lilo ai ‘o Pili i ali‘i no Hawai‘i, a he ali‘i ‘o Pili no Kahiki mai, a ua lilo ‘o ia i kupuna no nā ali‘i a me nā maka‘āinana o Hawai‘i", [it is the reason why ali‘i were sought from Kahiki, and this is how Pili became the ali‘i of Hawai‘i, Pili was an ali‘i from Kahiki, he became the ancestor of the ali‘i and maka‘āinana of Hawai‘i].[11]

In the mo‘olelo of La‘amaikahiki (La‘a from Kahiki), La‘a was the son or nephew of the great voyaging chief Mo‘ikeha. Mo‘ikeha had made the journey from Kahiki to Hawai‘i, but La‘a remained behind in Kahiki. Mo‘ikeha trained his favorite son, Kila, in the skills of navigation in order to fetch La‘a. Kila traveled to Kahiki where La‘a was heir to the ali‘i Olopana (brother of Mo‘ikeha). Olopana denied Kila's request to take La‘a, so Kila returned to Hawai‘i.[12] Upon the death of Olopana, La‘a was eager to leave Kahiki because Kila had spoken about the rich lands, strong farmers, and bountiful fishponds of Hawai‘i. Just like Pā‘ao, La‘a

[8] Kamakau, *Ke Kumu Aupuni*, 31-32.
[9] Kamakau, *Ke Kumu Aupuni*, 33. Translation my own.
[10] Kamakau, *Ke Kumu Aupuni*, 33-34
[11] Kamakau, *Ke Kumu Aupuni*, 34. Translation my own. Pā‘ao most likely arrived in Hawai‘i sometime in the 12th century CE. In addition to bringing Pili, Pā‘ao is also credited with re-structuring Hawaiian society and introducing new religious practices. Hewahewa, Kamehameha's kahuna, was descended from Pā‘ao.
[12] Kamakau, *Ke Kumu Aupuni*, 37-39. Kila returned to Puna, and was the ali‘i of Hawai‘i Island. According to the mo‘olelo, he became the ancestor of the ali‘i and maka‘āinana of Hawai‘i and Maui.

brought an entire entourage from Kahiki—a kahuna, kāula, a navigator, an architect, a drummer, plus another forty individuals. The most important facet of La‘a’s migration was the introduction of the pahu (drum) and the kā‘eke‘eke (bamboo instrument) into Hawaiian society.[13] The mo‘olelo of La‘amaikahiki was not only about bringing another ali‘i from Kahiki, but also about the introduction of “new” cultural practices.

Pele and Hi‘iaka as Malihini in ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui’s *Voices of Fire*

As previously stated, the mo‘olelo *Hi‘iakaikapoliopele* is the account of two travels; Pele’s migration from Kahiki to Hawai‘i, and Hi‘iaka’s circuit of the islands. In *Voices of Fire: Reweaving the Literary Lei of Pele and Hi‘iaka*, scholar of Hawaiian literature ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui stated that thirteen different full-length versions of *Hi‘iakaikapoliopele* were published in the Hawaiian language nūpepa between 1860-1928. Additionally, an extensive collection of over 500 mele exist about Pele and Hi‘iaka.[14]

Although Pele is the volcanic and fire deity of Hawai‘i, her origin is in Pola Pola, Kahiki. Ho‘omanawanui reimagined the word Kahiki as “ka-hiki”:

> But hiki has related possible meanings, including possibility, to arrive at a destination and ‘to fetch’ or ‘to carry back and forth,’ all suggesting the multiple (and successful) voyages across the vast Pacific. Through the arrival and settlement of voyaging akua and kanaka, new mo‘okū‘auhau [genealogies/lineages] were woven into existing ones.[15]

Pele is yet another thread in the cordage linking Kahiki and Hawai‘i. Mele such as “Holo mai Pele” and “Mai Kahiki mai ka wahine ‘o Pele” are integral to the understanding of Pele’s migration because they “intimately detail the preparations for travel, record the names of the entourage who accompanied her, their status and roles, and possible motivation for departing Kahiki.”[16] Pele did not just travel alone; she brought her family who were deities as well. In an

[13] Kamakau, *Ke Kumu Aupuni*, 39-40. La‘a became the ancestor of ali‘i and maka‘āinana across the archipelago.
[14] ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui, *Voices of Fire: Reviewing the Literary Lei of Pele and Hi‘iaka*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), xxiv-xxv.
[15] ho‘omanawanui, 25-26.
[16] ho‘omanawanui, 25. In the mele “Mai Kahiki mai ka wahine ‘o Pele”, Pele and her family left Kahiki because of an eruption. In some versions of the mo‘olelo, Pele was exiled from Kahiki by her sister Nāmakaokaha‘i. The two engaged in an epic battle as Pele traveled to Hawai‘i. Pele’s physical body was destroyed, but her spiritual being remained intact.

egg close to her bosom, Pele carried her dear younger sister Hiʻiakaikapoliopele (lit. Hiʻiaka in the bosom of Pele). Her brother Kamohoaliʻi was the shark god who led the canoe called *Honuaiākea* ("earth explorer"). This waʻa was carved specifically for this journey, which hoʻomanawanui said was a symbol of the months of preparation that went into the voyage.[17]

When Pele and her family arrived in the archipelago, they traveled west to east: Nihoa, Kaʻula, Niʻihau, Lehua, Kauaʻi, Oʻahu, Lānaʻi, Kahoʻolawe, Maui, and finally Hawaiʻi. On each island, members of the voyage disembarked and settled. Pele used her ʻōʻō (digging stick) to seek her own home; as a result, she formed specific craters on each island. It was at Halemaʻumaʻu crater on the Kīlauea volcano where Pele found her permanent residence. The west-east travel path of Pele's migration has greater significance. In the koihonua (cosmology moʻolelo) *Kumulipo*, Papa (Earth-mother) and Wākea (Sky-father) procreate and the islands are birthed east-west, or "oldest" to "youngest". Scholars such as hoʻomanawanui and Noenoe Silva have argued that Pele's migration is an alternative to the male hierarchy and ʻai kapu (sacred eating) established in *Kumulipo*.[18] Furthermore, when Pele prodded the earth with her ʻōʻō, the craters that formed were permanent alterations to the land, she was literally and metaphorically leaving her mark on the ʻāina. Pele's travel reflects the geological understanding of the formation of the Hawaiian archipelago; the oldest islands (and atolls) are those in the Northwest Hawaiian Islands, while Hawaiʻi Island in the southeast is the youngest and continues to grow.

Pele's voyage to Hawaiʻi is only the beginning of *Hiʻiakaikapoliopele*. The majority of the moʻolelo follows Hiʻiaka's physical journey and her maturation into a strong young woman. In the moʻolelo, Pele's spirit transcended her body while asleep. Although she was on Hawaiʻi Island, she could hear drumming from Kauaʻi. On Kauaʻi (in her transcended form), she met the handsome aliʻi Lohiʻau, and the two fell in love. However, Pele needed to leave Lohiʻau in order to return to her body. Heart-broken, Lohiʻau committed suicide.

Pele asked each of her sisters to go to Kauaʻi to get Lohiʻau, but they all refused because Pele was unpredictable. In various moʻolelo, Pele is often portrayed as being extremely powerful, but also very irrational and sometimes quickly consumed by jealousy. Hiʻiaka, the youngest sister, volunteered to undertake the task. In return, Pele agreed to watch over Hiʻiaka's

[17] hoʻomanawanui, 31-32. Hoʻomanawanui argued that the presence of Kamohoaliʻi in the mele is "suggesting the canoe follows a migratory path of manō. It is a metaphor poetically describing the electromagnetic sensors sharks use to follow the magma (pele) hotspots across the Pacific plate, something now confirmed by Western science."
[18] hoʻomanawanui, 152-153.

companion Hōpoe and to protect Hi‘iaka’s lehua (*Metrosideros polymorpha*) groves. Pele informed Hi‘iaka that she was not allowed be intimate with Lohi‘au, for he was Pele’s. To help Hi‘iaka on her journey, Pele bestowed different powers upon her. Hi‘iaka brought along two traveling partners, Pā‘ūopala‘e and Wahine‘ōma‘o. Throughout the journey; Hi‘iaka and her partners battle manō (sharks), mo‘o (powerful lizards), as well as kānaka (humans). In compliment to Hi‘iaka’s power to destroy is her ability to heal and to defend the weak.[19]

As Hi‘iaka headed west to Kaua‘i, she reunited with her family members that had settled during the initial migration from Kahiki. When Hi‘iaka mā finally arrived on Kaua‘i, they rescued Lohi‘au and Hi‘iaka revived him. On return to Hawai‘i Island, Hi‘iaka discovered that Pele had killed Hōpoe and destroyed her lehua grove. At the edge of Halema‘uma‘u, Hi‘iaka shared an intimate moment with Lohi‘au to spite Pele. Pele tried to kill Lohi‘au, but Hi‘iaka threatened to extinguish the fires of Kīlauea. Pele had broken the agreement because she thought Hi‘iaka had been intimate with Lohi‘au because they took so long to return. However, Hi‘iaka’s journey was long simply because she had to overcome many obstacles and encounters. At the conclusion of the mo‘olelo, Pele respected the powers of Hi‘iaka and ultimately recognized her as an equal. For Hi‘iaka, her journey was her proving ground and testament to her maturation.[20]

In *Voices of Fire,* ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui discussed two very important themes of *Hi‘iakaikapoliopele*, ‘āina and ho‘okipa. Place names (inoa ‘āina) are prevalent throughout the entirety of the mo‘olelo. As Hi‘iaka ventured from place to place, island to island, the names of each individual ‘āina were recorded in both the narrative and within the various mele and ‘oli Hi‘iaka performed. Hi‘iaka demonstrated herself as knowledgeable traveler by referencing specificities of each place.[21] For example, when Hi‘iaka made her circuit of O‘ahu, she was completely enamored by the sea of Waialua. While she stood near the shore, at a place called Kehauohapu‘u, she presented the following oli:

O Waialua kai leo nui	Waialua, of the loud-voiced sea.
Ua lono ka uka o Lihue	Heard in the uplands of Lihue
Ke wa ala Wahiawa e,	Roaring far to Wahiawa
Kuli wale, kuli wale i ka leo,	Completely deafened, deafened by the voice

[19] ho‘omanawanui, 28.
[20] ho‘omanawanui, 29-30.
[21] ho‘omanawanui, 105.

He leo no ke kai—e.[22]	It is the voice of the sea.

This specific oli is relatively short in comparison to other mele and oli found in *Hi'iakaikapoliopele*, yet it contains three place names: Waialua, Līhu'e, and Wahiawā. Hi'iaka described Waialua as a place where the leo (voice) of the sea is so loud that it could be heard at Līhu'e. Again, she chanted that the wā (roar) was heard at Wahiawā. Both Līhu'e and Wahiawā are miles and miles mauka (upland) of Waialua, towards central O'ahu. The fourth line of the oli "Kuli wale…" is an auditory experience that is overwhelming for both Hi'iaka and the listeners (readers) of this mo'olelo. As Hi'iaka was standing on the edge of the roaring water, everything around her was kuli wale (completely deafened). For those listening to this oli, they had to imagine and believe in the power of Hi'iaka's leo. If Hi'iaka's voice was too weak, the roar of the waves would have drowned it out. Instead, her voice is strong enough to cut through the noise of the competing sea.

Ho'omanawanui explained that, "Place names are also meiwi, poetic devices that contain history and story. Whereas haole saw empty, desolate lands, inoa 'āina are sites of cultural memory."[23] Through place names one can recall specific peoples or events; place names are not just random labels bestowed upon land. 'Āina is not static either, Hi'iaka "calls out to the 'āina who are living beings."[24] An example of this is in Hi'iaka's encounter with Makapu'u ("bulging eye") and Kauhi'īliomakaonalani ("the concealed dog eyes of the heavens"). These entities are physical land forms but also very much living beings, in fact they were Hi'iaka's relatives, she spoke to them and offered oli.[25]

Hi'iaka interacted with 'āina through her battles, as both 'āina and foe shared the same name. One of the first battles she fought was against the mo'o named Pana'ewa. Pana'ewa is also the name of the vast lowland forest in Hilo. Hi'iaka defeated another mo'o, Mokoli'i, on the eastern side of O'ahu. Mokoli'i is the name of the small island outside of Kualoa Bay. The island represents the tail of the mo'o, while the aligning mountain ridge, Kualoa, is the "long back",

[22] M. J. Kapihenui, "He Mooolelo No Hiiakaikapoliopele. Helu 7," *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika,* (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 13 February 1862.
[23] ho'omanawanui, 55.
[24] ho'omanawanui, 155.
[25] ho'omanawanui, 155. In contemporary times, Kauhi'īliomakaonalani is incorrectly referred to as "Crouching Lion"

and Hakipuʻu is the "broken back".[26] Whether friend or foe, ʻāina was an integral part of Hiʻiaka's physical and metaphorical journey.

As hoʻomanawanui stated, moʻolelo such as *Hiʻiakaikapoliopele* challenge the Euro-American vision of land as empty, stagnant, and meaningless. In the moʻolelo, ʻāina also demanded respect or recognizance from Hiʻiaka. If Hiʻiaka was ignorant toward the ʻāina she would have offended her relatives, such as Makapuʻu and Kauhiʻīliomakaonalani; or she could have wandered unsuspectingly into a dangerous situation with one of the moʻo. In the context of contemporary tourism, hoʻomanawanui argued, "Hawaiʻi is marketed as a paradise and playground, a completely safe and benign place free of danger. Respect for the ʻāina is nonexistent in the discourse of tourism."[27] For tourists who have only experienced swimming in a swimming pool or small bodies of water, the ocean can quickly become a dangerous place. Tourists who accidentally or blissfully ignore the natural characteristics of ʻāina put themselves at risk. The failure to recognize ʻāina (both earth and water) can have fatal consequences.

Hoʻokipa, a form of hospitality, is the second important theme in hoʻomanawanui's discussion of *Hiʻiakaikapoliopele*. She stated, "Centuries before this cultural practice was misappropriated by Hawaiʻi's tourist industry, Kanaka Maoli offered hospitality to one another as a mark of civil conduct."[28] Hoʻokipa, as a cultural practice, consists of specific sets of etiquette and behavior on part of both malihini and kamaʻāina. In the moʻolelo, hoʻokipa is mutually rewarding for both parties while inhospitality is detrimental to the offending party. In the initial meeting between malihini and kamaʻāina, there was usually an oli or kāhea (call) that was exchanged. In some instances, the kamaʻāina would see Hiʻiaka mā traveling and would call out in invitation. Other times, Hiʻiaka would initiate the exchange and ask permission of the kamaʻāina.[29] Permission was paramount for the malihini because s/he was traveling (intruding) across someone else's ʻāina.

Numerous ʻōlelo noʻeau account the intricacies of hoʻokipa etiquette. One example is "He ola i ka leo kāhea. *There is life in a [hospitable] call.* A call of friendly hospitality gives cheer to the traveler (ON858)."[30] ʻŌlelo noʻeau also criticize and warn against inhospitable

[26] hoʻomanawanui, 156. Similar to Kauhiʻīliomakaonalani, Mokoliʻi is also incorrectly referred to as "Chinaman's Hat".
[27] hoʻomanawanui, 98.
[28] hoʻomanawanui, 120-121.
[29] hoʻomanawanui, 121.
[30] Mary Kawena Pukui, *ʻŌlelo Noʻeau*, 93.

behavior: "Mū ka waha heahea ʻole. *Silent is the mouth of the inhospitable*. It is considered rude not to call a welcome to anyone approaching one's home (ON2196)."[31] Another type of inhospitable behavor is stingyness: "He peʻe makaloa. *A hider among* makaloa *sedge*. A stingy person who keeps his eyes downcast while eating lest he see a passerby and be obliged to call him to come and share the meal (ON889)."[32]

Interestingly, the collection of ʻōlelo noʻeau that pertain to hoʻokipa seem to place the burden of hoʻokipa on the host. However, there are a few ʻōlelo noʻeau that advise travelers against abusing hoʻokipa. For example, "'Aʻohe hale i piha i ka hoihoi; haʻawi mai a lawe aku no. *No house has a perpetual welcome; it is given and it is taken away.* A warning not to wear out one's welcome (ON 138)."[33] The second is: "Hoʻokahi no lā o ka malihini. *A stranger only for a day*. After the first day as a guest, one must help with the work (ON1078)."[34] The intricacies of hoʻokipa etiquette dictated the fine line between the host's expected selflessness and the expectation that the guest is aware of the host's limits.

The most important part of hoʻokipa is the actual action, which includes entertainment and food. The stakes of hoʻokipa were raised even higher if the malihini was of status, such as an aliʻi, kahuna, or akua. Hiʻiaka and her companions are entertained by hula, mele, and games (such as kilu) in their various stays. Food preparation is the most basic, yet important, aspect of showing hoʻokipa. The kamaʻāina was responsible for gathering and preparing enough food for the malihini. Feeding one's guest was important because of the exhaustion of traveling. The ability to adequately feed guests also brought honor to the kamaʻāina. ʻŌlelo noʻeau reflect food preparation as well: "He ʻai leo ʻole, he ʻīpuka hāmama. *Food unaccompanied by a voice; a door always open.* Said about a home of a hospitable person. The food can be eaten without hearing a complaint from the owners, and the door is never closed to any visitor (ON518)."[35] Also, "Iaia a hiki, make ka puaʻa. *As soon as he arrived, the pig died*. It was the custom to kill and roast a pig when a very welcome guest arrived (ON1148)."[36]

Hoʻomanawanui provided several excellent examples of hoʻokipa from Hiʻiaka's journey. When Hi'iaka mā initially reached Kauaʻi they came across a disabled fisherman named

[31] Mary Kawena Pukui, *ʻŌlelo Noʻeau*, 239.
[32] Mary Kawena Pukui, *ʻŌlelo Noʻeau*, 96.
[33] Mary Kawena Pukui, *ʻŌlelo Noʻeau*, 18.
[34] Mary Kawena Pukui, *ʻŌlelo Noʻeau*, 115.
[35] Mary Kawena Pukui, *ʻŌlelo Noʻeau*, 61.
[36] Mary Kawena Pukui, *ʻŌlelo Noʻeau*, 125.

Malaehaʻakoa, who also happened to be a "devotee of Pele". Malaehaʻakoa was hospitable to the travelers; in return Hiʻiaka used her healing powers to strengthen him.[37] When Hiʻiaka mā are passing through Kailua, Oʻahu, they were taken in by a kalo farmer named Kanahau. Kanahau offered to cook a pig for the travelers, but Hiʻiaka only ate lūʻau (cooked kalo leaves). Kanahau adjusted his plan and cooked a tremendous amount of lūʻau for Hiʻiaka. Hoʻomanawanui remarked that this was a tedious task for the farmer. He woke in the night to start the fire and to gather all the kalo leaves. By the time Kanahau was done cooking, the sun had risen. Hiʻiaka feasted on the lūʻau so much so that Kanahau had to resume cooking. When Hiʻiaka was finally done, she praised Kanahau for his preparation of the lūʻau.[38] As hoʻomanawanui also noted, "Speed (ʻeleu) and perfection in food preparation is very important, as is the ʻono (deliciousness) and relishing of it."[39]

The moʻolelo of *Hiʻiakaikapoliopele* exhibits the consequences when hoʻokipa is improperly exhibited between malihini and kamaʻāina. One example is the encounter between Hiʻiaka and the aliʻi wahine Punahoa on Hawaiʻi Island. Punahoa was out surfing on the water and a crowd had gathered to watch her. The crowd constantly praised Punahoa's surfing skills. In response to this, Hiʻiaka predicted that Punahoa would fall, which drew backlash from the spectators. Sure enough, the steady-footed and skilled Punahoa was tossed from her board. The reason for Punahoa's fall, as hoʻomanawanui stated, is because the people did not acknowledge Hiʻiaka (as a deity) and they were rude to her. Hiʻiaka was able to foresee the fall, and at the same time caused the fall. As an aliʻi, Punahoa was punished because she was responsible for her people.[40]

The un-hoʻokipa-like encounter between Hiʻiaka and the aliʻi of Kahana, Oʻahu also took place on the waves. The aliʻi Palani and his wife ʻIewale were out surfing in Kahana bay. Following proper etiquette, Hiʻiaka offered a chant to the two aliʻi. Palani answered Hiʻiaka with a rude and condescending response, asking her who she thought she was and why was she called out to him. As a consequence for their inhospitable behavior, Hiʻiaka took control of the surf and drowned both Palani and ʻIewale.[41]

---

[37] hoʻomanawanui, 29.
[38] hoʻomanawanui, 121-122.
[39] hoʻomanawanui, 123-124.
[40] hoʻomanawanui, 103-104.
[41] hoʻomanawanui, 104-105. Additionally, hoʻomanawanui explained that the names of the two aliʻi, Palani and ʻIewale, are word play. Pālani means "skim lightly", perhaps referencing his surfing ability. Palani is also a reef fish

The most notorious act of defying hoʻokipa during Hiʻiaka's journey occurred on Maui at the home of the aliʻi ʻOlepau. Inside of the home, there was a huge feast happening but ʻOlepau's two wives, Waihīnano and Kaweloʻehuʻehu, did not accept Hiʻiaka and her companions, despite Hiʻiaka's chant. Kapōʻulakinaʻu (Hiʻiaka's sister) was particularly offended because she had raised Waihīnano.[42] As a result of the the wives' behaviour, Hiʻiaka chose to battle Waihīnano over the life of ʻOlepau through the exchange of chants and prayers. Hiʻiaka and Waihīnano went back and forth; Hiʻiaka tried to make ʻOlepau sick, while Waihīnano healed him. Both called upon their respective akua and moʻokūʻauhau to enhance their powers. Hiʻiaka finally asked Kapōʻulakinaʻu for support, and ʻOlepau was killed.[43]

In these three examples, all of the transgressors were guilty of failing to recognize Hiʻiaka as a both malihini and akua. As previously stated, hoʻokipa is a mutual set of behavior and etiquette for *both* malihini and kamaʻāina. As the quintessential malihini traveler, Hiʻiaka asked permission from kamaʻāina and most importantly, she showed her gratefulness for their hoʻokipa. Kamaʻāina, such as Malaehaʻakoa and Kanahau, who hosted Hiʻiaka and her companions were rewarded in both tangible and intangible ways. In the instances of rudeness, "social or kinship relationships are damaged or broken…such cultural and social expectations of courtesy and acknowledgement go a long way in maintaining positive relationships among individual and larger communities."[44] This is why Kapōʻulakinaʻu was so deeply offended by Waihīnano's rudeness. They shared a kinship relation, and by denying entry to Kapō, Waihīnano effectively denied their kinship.

Diplomacy and Race: 1842 and 1849

As the Kingdom of Hawaiʻi became increasingly entangled in global politics throughout the course of the 19th century, the Kingdom sought to carve out its place amongst the powerful nations of the world. In order to do so, several notable diplomatic missions were carried out. In

---

with a strong odor, which is a "not so subtle reflection of Palani's rude or 'stink' personality." For 'Iewale, "'Ie is a vine used to make chiefly items...It is also used to weave baskets to trap fish, 'ie palani being a recognized type; wale is an intensifier and a word for slime."

[42] hoʻomanawanui, 145-146.

[43] hoʻomanawanui, 150. Kapōʻulakinaʻu was a practitioner of ʻanāʻanā, which is usually translated to mean something along the lines of "sorcery" or "black magic." Kahuna ʻanāʻanā use prayers or incantations to affect another person.

[44] hoʻomanawanui, 107-108.

this section I focus on two memorable travels, first, Timoteo Haʻalilio and William Richards, and second, Alexander Liholiho and Lota Kapuāiwa. Encounters with race and racism abroad played an important role in how these travelers saw themselves in relation to the Kingdom and to Americans.

The reign of Kauikeaouli (1825-1854) was an era of massive change for the Kingdom represented by several important events. The first Hawaiian Constitution was ratified in 1840, which changed the Kingdom from an absolute monarchy to a constitutional monarchy. In 1843, the Kingdom was briefly occupied by British naval captain George Paulet. Five years later the infamous Māhele was put into place, forever altering land tenure in Hawaiʻi. Before passing away, Kauikeaouli introduced a new constitution in 1852.

One of Kauikeaouli's aspirations was to seek recognition of the Kingdom's sovereignty by the United States, Great Britain, and France. In 1842, he sent Timoteo Haʻalilio and William Richards on a diplomatic mission to secure recognition from these three world powers. Although Haʻalilio was not a part of the ruling royal family, he belonged to the aliʻi class. Prior to the diplomatic mission, he served as the royal secretary for the Kingdom. His traveling companion, William Richards, was a former ABCFM missionary turned government worker. Because Richards worked so closely with the Kingdom, Kauikeaouli sent him along to support Haʻalilio. Their mission was quite lengthy, taking almost three years. Sadly, only Richards made it back to Hawaiʻi in March 1845, as Haʻalilio passed away on the sail back several months prior.

Haʻalilio and Richards' experience with racism unfolded aboard the steamship *The Globe*, between New York and New Hampshire, shortly before they left for Europe. William Richards requested two meal tickets for their dining aboard the ship. However, when he picked the tickets up, he noticed there were two different tickets—one for Haʻalilio and one for himself. Haʻalilio's ticket was for a meal to be eaten in the servant's car with the Black steamship workers. The ticket agent assumed Haʻalilio was Richard's personal servant because Haʻalilio was dark-skinned. Despite Richards' attempts to clear up the situation, the agent said that Haʻalilio would not be welcomed to sit in the main dining area because he was "black". Instead of eating separately, Richards sat and ate with Haʻalilio in the servant's car.[45]

Why would William Richards voluntarily choose to sit in the servant's car with Haʻalilio? Richards was white, he could have sat and enjoyed the comfort of the main dining

[45] Beamer, 133-134.

area. Scholar Kamana Beamer argued that this was a defining moment for Richards, "He had come to Hawai'i as an American missionary, but he returned to the United States as a Hawaiian national. Richards' challenge to the systematic racism of his own homeland represents a nationalistic shift in his identity."[46] As a national of the Hawaiian Kingdom, Richards was bound to the social and cultural protocols of his new country. Ha'alilio was an ali'i, Richards was not; status trumped race in the Hawaiian Kingdom. Beamer further explained, Richards "could not change American racist practices, perhaps the next best thing would be to follow Hawaiian protocol while in America."[47] Although the focus of the racism was aimed at Ha'alilio, it was ultimately Richards who seemed to have been shaped by this experience. If Ha'alilio did not pass away before returning to Hawai'i, it would have been interesting to see how this incident affected his view of the United States, and possibly Kauikeaouli's domestic policy.

In 1849, another diplomatic mission was commissioned under the rule of Kauikeaouli. This time it was the princes Alexander Liholiho and Lota Kapuāiwa, along with Dr. Gerrit P. Judd (former missionary turned government official), who were sent to the U.S. and Europe. Both princes were still in their teens and this mission was an opportunity to learn about diplomacy and foreign relations. The purpose of this trip was to further strengthen the Kingdom's relationships with the other foreign powers, building upon the foundation set by Timoteo Ha'alilio and William Richards. Beamer stated the decision to send the two princes to accompany Judd was "an extension of Liholiho's early policy of establishing ali'i connections with the royalty of other countries. This move was also a significant step in preparing the next generation of mō'ī to be leaders in the international arena."[48] In preparation for this diplomatic mission, Alexander Liholiho and Lota Kapuāiwa "listened to the lecture of William Richards about his and Ha'alilio's diplomatic travels abroad."[49]

The contingent of Alexander Liholiho, Lota Kapuāiwa, and Dr. Judd left Hawai'i in 1849, crossing through the Americas, and sailing the Atlantic to meet with French and British officials. It was not until their return to the U.S. that the princes experienced racism. Aboard a train traveling on the northeastern coast, the train conductor attempted to evict Alexander

[46] Beamer, 134.
[47] Beamer, 134.
[48] Beamer, 165. Kauikeaouli's brother, Liholiho (Kamehameha II) traveled in 1823 with a contingent to meet King George of England. Liholiho wanted to establish a relationship with the British Crown and also learn from King George. Unfortunately, Liholiho never met King George. Many of the traveling party died after contracting the measles, including Liholiho and his wife Kamāmalu.
[49] Beamer, 166.

Liholiho out of their compartment because, like Haʻalilio, he was thought to be "black". Eventually the situation was sorted out and the conductor was corrected. However, Alexander Liholiho was extremely furious, rightfully so.[50] In his journal he kept during the mission, Alexander Liholiho wrote about the incident, which included a scathing critique of the United States and Americans. He fumed:

> Confounded fool! *The first time that I ever received such treatment, not in England, or France or anywhere else.* But in this country I must be treated like a dog to come and go at an American's bidding. *Here I must say that I am disappointed at the Americans. They have no manners, no politeness, not even common civilities to a stranger.* And not only in this single case, but almost everybody that one meets in the United States are saucy. Even the waiters in their hotels in answering a bell, instead of coming and knocking at the door, they stalk the room as if they were paying one a visit, and after one has given an order for something they pretend not to hear—give a grunt which cannot be exactly imitated by pen and paper, but would go something like—hu! In England an African can pay his fare for the Cars, and he can sit alongside of Queen Victoria. *The Americans talk, and they think a great deal of their liberty, and strangers often find that too many liberties are taken of their comfort, just because his host are a free people*.[51]

As a malihini in the U.S., Alexander Liholiho felt like the hoʻokipa etiquette that he was familiar with had not been extended to him. Like Haʻalilio, his status as a Hawaiian aliʻi had been cast aside for American racial prejudice. Beamer added, "In terms of culture and civility, Alexander Liholiho found the Americans distinctly inferior to the French, the British, and the Hawaiians. For the two princes, America appeared to be a country of commoners."[52] Whereas Euro-American narratives portrayed Native Hawaiians as inferior savages, Alexander Liholiho flipped the hierarchy upside down; it was not the Hawaiian Kingdom that was backwards, it was the United States.

Both princes carried their negative experience of the U.S. back to their Kingdom. Beamer elaborated, "This affinity for Britain, and the princes' distaste for American culture and society,

---

[50] Ruby Hasegawa Lowe, *Kamehameha IV*, (U.S.A.: Kamehameha Schools Press, 1997), 42-43.
[51] *The Journal of Prince Alexander Liholiho: The Voyages Made to the United States, England and France in 1849-1850*, edited by Jacob Adler, (Honolulu: The University of Hawaii Press/Hawaiian Historical Society, 1967), 108. Italicization my own.
[52] Beamer, 165.

significantly shaped their policies as mō‘ī.”[53] Several years after this trip, Kauikeaouli passed and Alexander Liholiho ascended to mō‘ī (Kamehameha IV). During his reign Alexander Liholiho was firmly pro-British. As a result, he did not entertain a proposed treaty of annexation offered by the United States. Alexander Liholiho also steered the government away from the Protestant American mission and towards the Episcopal church (Church of England).[54] Many of the ali‘i and high-ranking members of the government became members of the Church including Lota Kapuāiwa, Queen Emma Kaleleonālani Rooke (Alexander Liholiho’s wife), Kalākaua, and Lili‘uokalani. Alexander Liholiho saw the Episcopal church as being more liberal than the Protestant mission, and favored the church because of its “acceptance of aristocracy”.[55] Queen Emma had a very prominent role in Anglicanizing the Hawaiian Kingdom, she was part-British herself. They had even named their son Prince Albert, in honor of the British Prince Albert (Prince of Wales), who Alexander Liholiho had met during the diplomatic trip.[56] Emma and her husband pushed for the establishment and building of St. Andrew’s Church and St. Andrew’s Priory in Honolulu.

These examples of Kānaka ‘Ōiwi dealing with racism abroad are critical to the study of Hawaiian Kingdom history, as well as American history. For William Richards, the racism towards Timoteo Ha‘alilio solidified his allegience to the Kingdom and his status as a Hawaiian national. In the case of Alexander Liholiho and Lota Kapuāiwa, their disatrous experience with American racism directly influenced their domestic and foreign policies during their respective reigns. For both diplomatic missions, traveling allowed each individual to see the world beyond Hawai‘i; in turn, they realized that the Kingdom was on par with, or perhaps ahead of Western countries in terms of racial equality.

In the context of American history, these racial incidents are valuable in thinking about race and racism in 19th century America. In the common sphere, there is an extremely oversimplified perspective of the dichotomy between the North and South. Generally, the South is thought of as slave-holding, racist, and ultra-conservative, while the North is thought to be progressive, liberal, and a safe haven from racism. However, both racial incidents took place in the North. Former slaves may have been physically liberated in the North, but they were still

[53] Beamer, 170.
[54] Beamer, 171.
[55] Beamer, 172-173.
[56] Prince Albert was born in 1858 and sadly passed in 1862. Because of the close ties to the British monarchy, Queen Victoria of England was his godmother.

bonded by the invisible shackles of systematic and institutional racism. It was not as simple as black and white.

He mana ko ka huakaʻi: Kalākaua and Emma, Part I—A Royal Duel

As Lota Kapuāiwa neared the end of his life in 1872, he was pressured to choose a successor. The possible choices were Prince William Charles Lunalilo, Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop, or Princess Ruth Keʻelikolani. Although Pauahi had the strongest lineage as a Kamehameha, she politely declined because she felt she did not need to be a mōʻī to effectively serve Native Hawaiians. Ruth had a strong genealogy as well, but it was contested by many; additionally, it was thought that she was too "abrasive" to be mōʻī. With Pauahi and Ruth out of contention, Lunalilo was left standing. Based on genealogy, Lunalilo would have been the appropriate choice but Lota Kapuāiwa lacked confidence in Lunalilo. Thus, Lota Kapuāiwa passed without naming a succesor. As a result, the very first election for mōʻī was held in the Hawaiian Kingdom. David Kalākaua challenged Lunalilo in the general election, but Lunalilo was the overwhelmingly popular choice. However, Lunalilo's reign only lasted slightly over a year, as he fell ill and passed in early 1874. The death of Lunalilo meant that the reign of the Kamehameha dynasty had come to a close.

In 1874, the second (and last) election was a hotly contested game of thrones between Kalākaua and Emma. Because there were no high ranking aliʻi candidates directly descended from Kamehameha I, the election became a genealogical competition. In Liliʻuokalani's autobiograhy *Hawaii's Story*, she explained, "It must not be forgotton...that the unwritten law of Hawaii Nei required the greatest chief, or the one having the most direct claim to the throne, must rule."[57] Similar to Lunalilo in the 1872 election, Emma was the more popular choice amongst the public; this was because she had been married to Alexander Liholiho and because her genealogy was aligned with the Kamehamehas. Her pro-British stance also made her an attractive choice for mōʻī. Those who supported Emma called themselves "Emma-ites" or "Queen-ites". On the other hand, Kalākaua had experience working in the government and had the support of Americans in Hawaiʻi. Unlike the 1872 election, the 1874 election was a legislative vote not a general election, which did not work in Emma's favor. The Hawaiian

[57] Liliʻuokalani, 43.

legislature elected Kalākaua as mōʻī despite Emma's popularity amongst the public. This set off a riot in Honolulu as Emmaites were thoroughly displeased with the outcome.

Although Emma lost, she still maintained an intensely loyal following from the time of the election until the end of her life (1885). In the years following the election, Emma maintained an antagonistic relationship with Kalākaua and the new royal family. Liliʻuokalani criticized Emma's animosity not only towards her, but also towards Queen Kapiʻolani (Kalākaua's wife) in particular. Emma only acknowledged Kalākaua out of obligation but continued to ignore both Kapiʻolani and Liliʻuokalani. Emma did not attend many of the royal events and celebrations, which Liliʻu referred to as "feminine pettiness".[58] Obviously, Liliʻu was very protective of Kalākaua and Kapiʻolani, subtlety gloating over the new honor of their family. Liliʻu remarked, "Queen Emma never recovered from her great disappointment, nor could she reconcile herself to the fact that our family had been chosen as the royal line to succeed that of the Kamehamehas."[59] She added, "Queen Emma never forgave me [for] my own rank and position in the family which was chosen to reign over the Hawaiian people. It did not trouble me at all, but I simply allowed her to remain in the position in which she chose to place herself."[60] In *Emma: Hawaiʻi's Remarkable Queen,* historian George S. Kanahele explained, "unfortunately, Liliʻuokalani's intemperate, unforgiving, and one sided account is the only one available."[61] The true motive or source of Emma's antagonism towards Kapiʻolani may never be known. This royal drama was the theme of the 1870s and early 1880s.

He mana ko ka huakaʻi: Kalākaua and Emma, Part II—Kalākaua, 1874

Kalākaua still needed to prove himself as viable because his victory stood on shaky grounds. Travel was a key tool in reinforcing his authority as mōʻī amongst citizens and in global politics. One of the first activities of Kalākaua's reign was an island wide tour with various members of the royal family and other government officials. Several nūpepa articles from March and April 1874 documented Kalākaua's travel around Oʻahu, and to Kauaʻi, Maui, and Hawaiʻi

[58] Liliʻuokalani, 44, 49-50.
[59] Liliʻuokalani, 49.
[60] Liliʻuokalani, 51.
[61] Kanahele, *Emma*, 317.

Island.[62] These excursions were especially important for Prince William Pitt Leleiohōkū, Kālakaua's younger brother and heir, and Liliʻuokalani, his heir apparent. Tours gave the family the opportunity to be officially recognized as royalty and as public figures amongst makaʻāinana. Liliʻu commented, "it became proper and necessary for me to make a tour of the islands to meet the people, that all classes, rich and poor, planter or fisherman, might have an opportunity to become somewhat acquainted with the one who should be called to hold the highest executive office."[63]

Unlike the journey of Hiʻiaka, the royal family did not have to battle moʻo along the way, but they did have something else to fear—the Emmaites. While in Kāneʻohe, Oʻahu, Princess Miriam Likelike (Kalākaua's youngest sister) recieved a letter from her husband Archibald Cleghorn. He suggested Likelike return to Honolulu because "the time spent on the route would be wasted, because [the Emmaites] were all zealous partisans of Queen Emma".[64] However, the Emmaites showed proper hoʻokipa etiquette to the royal party and Likelike "was showered with marks of favor by the very adherents of Queen Emma, of whose disappointment she had been warned by her husband."[65] When they made their return through the thick mass of spectators in downtown Honolulu, the royal party also returned the respect to the Emmaites in attendance; "It was understood and accepted as a victorious procession; and out of sympathy for the disappointed dowager queen, our people refrained from noisy commemoration and loud cheering, and instead the men removed their hats, and the women saluted as we passed."[66] Hoʻokipa in the context of this particular journey operated on two levels, between aliʻi and makaʻāinana, and between malihini and kamaʻāina.

Liliʻu wrote that she was overwhelmed by their reception in the community because "the people opened their doors with an '*Aloha nui loa*' to us in words and in acts."[67] Liliʻu reflected on the nature of their royal excursion:

> In some nations the leaders, the chief rulers, have gone forth through districts conquered by the sword, and compelled the people to show their

[62] In chronological order: "Na Mea Hou o ke Alo Alii," *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), 14 March 1874., "Huakai Alii ia Hawaii a me Maui," *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi) 21 March 1874., "Ka Huakai A Ka Moi Kalakaua I Kauai," *Ka Nuhou*, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), 24 March 1874., and "Ka Huakai Alii. [Mai Ko Makou Mea Kakau Manao Kuikawa]," *Ko Hawaii Ponoi*, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), 15 April 1874.
[63] Liliʻuokalani, 56.
[64] Liliʻuokalani, 58.
[65] Liliʻuokalani, 58.
[66] Liliʻuokalani, 59.
[67] Liliʻuokalani, 56-57.

> subjugation. Our progress from beginning to end was a triumphal march, and might well be described as that awarded to victors; but there were no dying nor wounded mortals in our track. We had vanquished the hearts of the people; they showed to us their love; they welcomed me as Hawaiians always have the ruling chief; and to this day, without the slightest appeal on my part, they have shown that their love and loyalty to our family in general.[68]

This was not the end of the royal excursions for 1874. In the fall, it was Leleiohōkū who would make his own tour around the islands, accompanied by other aliʻi and government officials. As heir to the throne, he represented both the Kingdom and his brother Kalākaua. Leleiohōkū's travel was documented even more extensively than Kalākaua's trip. From September 5, 1874 to November 28, 1874, the Hawaiian language nūpepa *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* tracked Leleiohōkū's journey around Oʻahu, Hawaiʻi, Maui, and Kauaʻi.[69] Makaʻāinana also submitted "reports" to the nūpepa when they saw or interacted with Leleiohōkū and his party, almost like the paparazzi of contemporary times. The nūpepa articles also published speeches that Leleiohōkū delivered to citizens. In the article "Ka Huakai a ke Keiki Alii ma Hawaii" (October 24), *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* printed a dialogue between Leleiohōkū and the Komite Koho (Election Committee) of North Kona, Hawaiʻi.

From the Komite Koho o ka apana o Kona Akau (the Election Committee of North Kona):

> Ke pule nei makou i ka lokomaikai o ke Akua Mana Loa, e malama mai i ko kakou Moi, a ia oe e ke Keiki Alii, ka Hooilina Moi o ko Hawaii nei Pae Aina, kou Kai[k]uahine Alii, ke Kama Alii Wahine Likelike, a me na hoa ukali o ka huakai alii ma kau kaahele a puni keia mau pae moku.[70]

---

[68] Liliʻuokalani, 59-60.

[69] In chronological order: "Ka Huakai Kaapuni A Ke Keiki Alii Leleiohoku," *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa,* (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), 5 September 1874., "Ka nee ana o ka Huakai a ke Keiki Alii," *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), 12 September 1874., "Huakai a ke Keiki Alii," *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), 26 September 1874., "Ka Nee Ana O Ka Huakai A Ke Keiki Alii!," *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), 26 September 1874., "Ka Huakai a ke Keiki Alii," *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), 3 October 1874., "Ka Huakai a ke Keiki Alii ma Hawaii," *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), 24 October 1874., "Ka Huakai A Ke Keiki Alii," *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), 31 October 1874., "Ka Huakai a ke keiki Alii ma Hawaii," *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), 14 November 1874., and finally, "Ka Huakai a ke Keiki Alii," *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), 28 November 1874.

[70] "Ka Huakai a ke Keiki Alii ma Hawaii," *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), 24 October 1874. Translation my own.

> We pray by the grace of the all mighty God, to protect our Mōʻī [Kalākaua], and you young aliʻi [Leleiohōkū], the heir of our Hawaiʻi, your sister aliʻi [Liliʻuokalani], the young aliʻi wahine Likelike, and all the companions of the royal excursion on your tour around these islands.

Leleiohōkū responded in deep gratitude:

> Ua loaa mai iaʻu ka hanohano nui mai a oukou mai na Komite Koho o ka apana o Kona Akau nei. Me oukou koʻu puuwai a ke aloha. He mea kamahao loa keia i hoike ole ia mamua ma kau huakai a puni o Oahu, aka, i koʻu hiki ana mai nei iwaena o oukou e na makaainana o ka apanao Kona Akau nei, ua hoike mai oukou i ko na makaainana makee alii ano maoli. Aohe aʻu wahi makana e ae e panai akuʻi ia oukou, eia wale no o ke aloha ko oukou a pau.[71]
>
> I have received a great honor from you, the Election Committee of North Kona. My aloha-filled heart is with you all. This is a wonderful thing that was not displayed before in my travel around Oʻahu, but, in my arrival before you, the makaʻāinana of North Kona, you have shown the makaʻāinana's true affection for your aliʻi. I do not have another gift to reciprocate to you, here alone is my aloha for all of you.

Leleiohōkū's island tour was really an extension of Kalākaua's tour in the earlier part of 1874. Like Liliʻu on Kalākaua's tour, this was a chance for Leleiohōkū to connect with makaʻāinana communities, especially those who had supported his family during the election. Royal tours taken by mōʻī and aliʻi post-accession were an already established tradition. Prior to Kālakaua, both Lunalilo and Lota Kapuāiwa had taken trips immediately following their respective accessions to the throne. Liliʻuokalani continued what she called the "the usual royal tour of the islands" when she became mōʻī in 1891, visiting Hawaiʻi, Maui, Molokaʻi, Kauaʻi, and Niʻihau.[72] By circuiting the Hawaiian Islands in 1874, Kālakaua and his aliʻi siblings Liliʻuokalani, Likelike, and Leleiohōkū sought to solidfy their family's rule in the eyes of all makaʻāinana, especially the Emmaites.

[71] "Ka Huakai a ke Keiki Alii ma Hawaii," *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), 24 October 1874. Translation my own.
[72] Liliʻuokalani, 220-221.

He mana ko ka huakaʻi: Kalākaua and Emma, Part III—Emma, 1874

Emma went on her own huakaʻi around Oʻahu during November 1874. According to Kanahele, Emma asked John Adams "J. A." Kuakini Cummins to organize the royal huakaʻi. Cummins was member of the Legislature and one of Kalākaua's strongest supporters. Kanahele noted that despite Cummins' political allegiance, he had always been a friend to Alexander Liholiho and Emma, hosting them on various occasions.[73] Cummins was a socialite of the Hawaiian Kingdom, known for throwing lavish parties at his Waimānalo estate "Mauna Loke". In fact, when the Duke of Edinburgh came to Hawaiʻi in 1869, Lota Kapuāiwa delegated Cummins to host an extravagant reception feast. It was one of the most memorable events of that time.[74] Cummins' expertise in luxurious celebrations made him the ideal organizer for Emma's huakaʻi.

The traveling party consisted of Emma, Cummins, Kekelaokalani (Emma's mother), other aliʻi, and another 140 women on horseback. They traveled through Honolulu and south east Oʻahu, around to Makapuʻu, and arrived at Mauna Loke in Waimānalo. Here, she was welcomed by the sounding of horns and prostrating makaʻāinana. The entertainment and feasting at Mauna Loke stretched over the course of three days. Besides hula, Cummins provide other forms of entertainment for Emma such as heʻe puʻewai (up stream surfing), rifle shooting, and horse racing.[75]

After the festivities in Waimānalo were finished, the traveling party continued their journey up the east side of Oʻahu. Emma was showered with hoʻokupu (offerings and gifts) throughout the huakaʻi, so much so that a boat was needed to haul the items back to Honolulu—three times. As Kanahale wrote, "If a people's love could be calculated in weights and measures, the queen had a supply sufficient to last the rest of her years."[76] Like Hiʻiaka, Emma also returned the hoʻokipa shown by the kamaʻāina. She distributed "large quantities of blankets,

[73] George S. Kanahele, *Emma: Hawai'i's Remarkable Queen*, (Honolulu, University of Hawaiʻi Press, 1999), 307.
[74] "Hala Ia Kamaaina a Kanaka Koʻi Koʻi o ka Aina," *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), March 28, 1913.
[75] Kanahele, *Emma: Hawai'i's Remarkable Queen*, 308-309. In regards to heʻe puʻewai in the Puha River: "When the men created a twenty-foot opening in the sand that dammed the stream, the water rushed out at the rate of thirty knots, and only two men and two women dared to ride the bore of wild surf. To reward their feat, the queen presented each with $100 and four pairs of red blankets."
[76] Kanahele, *Emma*, 309. Some of Emma's recieved hoʻokupu included: 41 pigs, 4 sheep, 800 dried ʻanae (mullet), 8 bundles of dried ʻanae, 16 barrels of poi, 96 chickens, 36 turkeys, 12 geese, 10 bags of rice, 20 sacks of sweet potato.

calico or cotton cloth, and shirts called *ue wahine*."[77] It is clear in these accounts that Emma was very much loved and strongly supported by the people, even in the aftermath of the election. The final celebration was hosted by Princess Ruth Keʻelikolani at her Moanalua estate. By the time Emma and her traveling party returned to Honolulu, the number of travelers had ballooned to 800 people. In total, the huakaʻi lasted for fifteen days, and there was no doubt it was grand.[78]

Kanahele stated that this tour was definitely politcally motivated. Although the election for mōʻī had been decided, Emma could still flex her political clout in the later 1876 Legislative election. The Emmaite candidates ran on the platform of being anti-Reciprocity, the major issue at the time. The election turned out to be quite successful for the Emmaites as the candidates secured positions as representatives in the Legislature, which greatly pleased Emma.[79]

He mana ko ka huakaʻi: Kalākaua and Emma, Part IV—Kalākaua, 1881

Seven years later in 1881, Kalākaua embarked on his most famous huakaʻi: a world trip. He was the first reigning monarch to completely circle the globe. He traveled to places such as Japan, Siam (Thailand), India, Egypt, numerous European countries, and across the United States. Kalākaua was greatly interested in learning about other cultures and building relationships with various nations.[80] Like his 1874 island tour, Kalākaua's trip was a way to both re-affirm and elevate his mana as mōʻī. Of course, Emma paid close attention to this groundbreaking trip. George Kanahele stated that in Emma's diary entry on January 20, 1881 (the day Kalākaua left), she criticized Kalākaua's huakaʻi as a 'tour of pleasure & self praise.' She also speculated (incorrectly) that Kalākaua was trying to sell Hawaiʻi to another nation.[81]

Along with being a diplomat, Kalākaua was a tourist. While abroad, Kalākaua wrote and sent many letters back to the Kingdom, to government officials, and to his family. In private letters to Liliʻu he expressed his awe of traveling to places that the two had only heard of in their youth, "during our school days in our geography, strange that I should live to be able to see them…for we have often declared (between ourself) the realization of our early childhood

[77] Kanahele, *Emma*, 309.
[78] Kanahele, *Emma*, 309.
[79] Kanahele, *Emma*, 310-311.
[80] Joseph M. Poepoe, and George Brown. *Ka Moolelo o ka Moi Kalakaua I*, (Honolulu: Hollister & Co., 1891), 26-32.
[81] Kanahele, *Emma*, 326.

dreams."[82] Kalākaua's letters offer amusing anecdotes, such as when he discovered that the Red Sea was so vast that its banks were not actually visible.[83]

Correspondences with Kingdom officials provide insight into the diplomacy of Kalākaua's journey and his inexperience with diplomatic affairs. Throughout his letters, Kalākaua was unprepared for the custom of exchanging honors and medals between governments. In a letter to William L. Green, the Kingdom Minister of Foreign Affairs, he urgently told Green to officially establish a formal set of "orders and decorations" for the Hawaiian Kingdom to bestow upon foreign officials.[84] He even confessed to Lili'u, "It has been very embarrassing to me in not having the orders of the diplomas to grant and I have tried to expidite[*sic*] the manufacture of the orders instead of waiting and receiving the orders from home."[85] Kalākaua was learning the intricacies of diplomacy on the fly.

In *No Mākou Ka Mana*, Kamana Beamer argued that Kalākaua's visit to Japan and Siam were the most informing to Kalākaua because both nations were non-Western, sovereign nations. Emperor Meiji of Japan and King Souditch-Chou-Fa-Chulalong Korn of Siam were both divine rulers as well, which Kalākaua compared to the ali'i traditions of the Hawaiian Kingdom. Beamer stated, "Kalākaua's exposure to non-Christian religious practices within relatively harmonious societies likely encouraged him to contemplate the possibility of openly reviving traditional Hawaiian cultural practices."[86]

Kalākaua vehemently expressed his hostility towards Christianity in two different letters to Lili'uokalani. During the first half of 1881, there was a major smallpox outbreak in Hawai'i, which killed nearly 300 citizens. He wrote to Lili'u in a seemingly mocking tone:

> As you are a religious and praying woman, Oh! All the religious people praise you! But what is the use of prayer after 293 lives of our poor people

[82] "The Royal Tourist—Kalakaua's Letters Home from Tokio to London," edited by Richard A. Greer, *Hawaiian Journal of History*, volume 5, (1971), 85.
[83] Greer, "The Royal Tourist", 87. In a letter to Lili'u, "The romance of poetry is lost, while sailing up the Red Sea where you have to traverse 1305 miles being the true distance from Aden to Suez without land or rock to break the monotony….I once believed that the Red Sea was a charming Sea to Sail upon, where land could be visible on each side, but it is that [we] have already seen the realities."
[84] Greer, "The Royal Tourist", 77. Kalākaua's proposed orders: 1st. G. Cross. Kamehameha I Cordon & Collar, 2nd Gr. Cross Kamehameha I Cordon, 3rd High Grand Officer, Star and Cross on Neck, 4th Grand Officer Star, 5th Knight Commander Cross on Neck, 6th Knight Companion Cross on Breast with *Rosette*, lastly, 7th Chavelier [*sic*] Cross on Breast.
[85] Greer, "The Royal Tourist", 103.
[86] Beamer, 179.

> have gone to their everlasting place. Is it to thank him [God] for killing or is it to thank him for sending them to him or to the other place which I never believed in the efficacy of prayer and consequently I never allowed myself to be ruled by the Churchmembers to allow a thanksgiving prayer to be offered to God for the good of the nation for in my opinion it is only a mockery. To save the life of the people is to work and not pray. To find and stop the causes of death of our people and not cry and whine like a child and say to god 'that it is good oh Lord that thou hath visited us thus.'[87]

Kalākaua's scathing opinons are eye opening because Lili'u was a devout Christian herself. However, he must have felt comfortable enough to express his true feelings because they were siblings. In another letter to Lili'u, Kalākaua recalled his experience of Vienna, Austria on a Sunday afternoon. He wrote that many bands were playing music, people were drinking beer, enjoying the theatre and opera, going to the store, and of course attending church. Kalākaua asked:

> …can it possibly be that all these light hearted happy people are all going to [Hell]? All enjoying nature as natures best gift? Surely not! *But what a contrast to our miserable bigoted community*. All sober and down in the mouth keeping a wrong Sabbath instead of a proper Sunday, the Pure are so pure that the impure should make the Sunday a day [of] mockery, with such rubbish trash that we have so long been lead [*sic*] to believe, *it is a wonder that we have not risen any higher than the common brute.*[88]

This excerpt is fascinating because Kalākaua accused Christianity of preventing the Hawaiian Kingdom from being more progressive. The "miserable bigoted community" made sure people kept Sabbath, whereas Kalākaua just wanted to enjoy a "proper Sunday", like the one he experienced in Vienna. As the mō'ī of a "Christian" kingdom, Kalākaua felt pressured to appease the vocal Christian community. It does not appear that he wanted to totally abolish Christianity, but instead he desired a kingdom that would include both the old gods and the new, without forcing people in either direction. It is imperative to remember that these letters were private communications between Kalākaua and his trusted sister Lili'u. If somehow his words had been leaked to the public, there is no telling what sort of additional backlash Kalākaua would have faced.

[87] Greer, "The Royal Tourist", 90.
[88] Greer, "The Royal Tourist", 105. Italicization my own.

Although these letters were private, when Kalākaua returned to his Kingdom, he made a very public announcement in the form of a kaena. Kaena are boasts that one would use to amplify his/her own self or accomplishments. Kalākaua's kaena was simply called "Ke Kaena a ka Mōʻī Kalākaua" (The kaena of Mōʻī Kalākaua). In the kaena, Kalākaua proclaimed that he had seen many countries and that he was equal to all of them; that he was confident, fearless, and—had the full support of his people.[89] His kaena was the proverbial gauntlet to any person who thought the Hawaiian Kingdom was inferior, or who accused him of being an incapable ruler, or who challenged the mana of his genealogy.

He mana ko ka huakaʻi: Kalākaua and Emma, Part V—Emma, 1882

About a year after Kalākaua's world trip, Emma ventured on a huakaʻi to Mauna Kea on Hawaiʻi Island in the fall of 1882. In the article "A Maunakea ʻo Kalani", Kīhei and Mapuana de Silva explained that Emma had continuously experienced loss in her life. Her young son, Prince Albert, and husband, Alexander Liholiho, both passed in the 1860s, and then she lost the election; and as time progressed, her political clout had slipped to Kalākaua.[90] Prior to Emma's Mauna Kea trip, another Legislative election had been held in the beginning of 1882. Unlike the 1876 election, the Emmaites were unsuccessful and lost their political foothold. Kanahele argued that this was a result of Kalākaua's world tour and the economic prosperity of the Kingdom.[91] Compounded with the failed election was the attempted assassination of Emma's friend, Queen Victoria of England, in the spring of 1882. Emma was extremely distraught and saddened at the near loss of her beloved royal peer.[92] Despite her losses and near-losses, Emma "nor her people had given up hope, political activism, or poetic discourse".[93] Emma's huakaʻi to Mauna Kea was political like her grand tour of Oʻahu in 1875; but was a deeply personal and spiritual pilgrimage as well.[94]

---

[89] Beamer, 179. The full text of Kalākaua's kaena can be read in the nūpepa article "Ke Kaena A Ka Moi Kalakaua," *Ke Au Hou*, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi), 14 February, 1912.
[90] Kīhei de Silva and Mapuana de Silva, "A Maunakea ʻo Kalani," Kamehameha Schools, 2006.
[91] Kanahele, *Emma*, 347.
[92] Kanahele, *Emma*, 347-348.
[93] Kīhei de Silva, and Mapuana de Silva, "E Hoʻi ka Nani i Mānā," Kamehameha Schools, 2006.
[94] Kīhei de Silva, and Mapuana de Silva, "E Hoʻi ka Nani i Mānā," Kamehameha Schools, 2006. The de Silvas noted other aliʻi pilgrimages to Mauna Kea: Kamehameha I, Kaʻahumanu (1828), Kauikeaouli (1830), Alexander Liholiho (1849), and Emma's cousin, Peter Young Kaʻeo (1854).

Emma's decision to visit Mauna Kea was deliberate and calculated. Mauna Kea is the highest point in the Hawaiian archipelago, its summit standing nearly 14,000ft. above sea level. If Mauna Kea was measured from sea level, it would register at over 30,000ft., surpassing Mt. Everest. On Mauna Kea is Lake Waiau, the highest water source in Hawai'i (13,000ft). Numerous mo'olelo are associated with Mauna Kea, involving deities such as Poli'ahu, Waiau, Lilinoe, Kahoupokane, and Kūkahau'ula. Many of the individual 'āina on the mountain are named after these akua. Both the summit region and Waiau are regarded as the "piko o Wākea", the naval of Wākea. The summit is the highest point and therefore acts as a portal to the heavens, an access way to the sky-father Wākea. By re-connecting with significant 'āina (associated with akua), Emma sought to re-align and re-elevate herself and her genealogy.

On the trek to Mauna Kea, Emma was led by two guides, William Seymour Lindsey from Waimea, and Waiaulima, a kaukau ali'i from Kawaihae. In addition to the guides were Emma's po'e kau lio (horse riders). It was a grueling trip even for expert horse riders such as Emma and her po'e kau lio. There were no real roads or trails leading up the mountain. Although O'ahu was slowly advancing in infrastructure, the other islands, including Hawai'i, were still behind. It most likely took at least six hours to ascend Mauna Kea.[95] The nūpepa article "Ka Moiwahine Emma Kaleleonalani" (14 October 1882) noted that Princess Likelike also accompanied Emma, which is surprising considering Emma's strained relation with the Kalākaua family.[96] Emma's travel was documented in several forms: eight mele composed during the huaka'i, two accounts from Lindsey's descendants, Mary Kalani Ka'apuni Phillips and James Kahalelaumāmane Lindsey, and two articles published in the nūpepa.[97]

The eight mele are referred to as Emma's "Mele Pi'i Maunakea" (mele of ascending Maunakea). In *He Lei no 'Emalani*, Hawaiian language scholar Puakea Nogelmeier categorized these mele into two types: mele māka'ika'i (describe the travel) and mele kālai'āina (political).

---

[95] Kīhei de Silva, and Mapuana de Silva, "E Ho'i ka Nani i Mānā," Kamehameha Schools, 2006. The de Silvas estimated six hours based upon British explorer Isabella Bird's account. Emma was well regarded as a horse rider, earning the nickname "Wahine Holo Lio" (horse-riding woman).

[96] "Ka Moiwahine Emma Kaleleonalani," *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina*, (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 14 October 1882.

[97] The two interviews were conducted by University of Hawai'i-Hilo Hawaiian Language professor Larry Kimura. Phillips' interview is the Bishop Museum Archives Audio Collection (cited by de Silva and de Silva). A transcription of James Lindsey's interview can be read in the report "Mauna Kea, the famous land summit of the land (Mauna Kea, ka piko kaulana o ka 'āina), a collection of Native Traditions…" by Kepa Maly and Onaona Maly, 2005. The two nūpepa accounts are: "Emma Kaleleonalani Ma Kohala,"*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa,* (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 14 October 1882; and "Ka Moiwahine Emma Kaleleonalani," *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina*, (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 14 October 1882.

Seven of the mele are mele mākaʻikaʻi: "E Hoʻi ka Nani i Mānā", "Kaulana ke Anu i Waikiʻi", "Eia ka Makana e Kalani lā", "Hau Kakahiaka Nui ʻo Kalani", "Kō Leo ka Maʻalewa", "E Aha ʻia ana Maunakea", and "A Maunakea ʻo Kalani". The final mele, "Kūwahine Hā Kou Inoa" is a mele kālaiʻāina.

The mele kālaiʻāina "Kūwahine Hā Kou Inoa" is an exceedingly powerful composition (196 lines) that boasted of Emma's lineage, her capability as a leader, and the support of her followers. Below is the opening and closing verses of the mele that provide a glimpse into the general essence of the mele. The lines are accompanied by Nogelmeier's translation and footnotes in *He Lei no ʻEmalani*.[98]

Here are the opening lines of the mele[99]:

Kūwahine hā kou inoa	Kūwahine[100] indeed is your name
ʻO ka wahine noho aupuni	The woman who rules the kingdom
I noho ʻia mai Hawaiʻi a Kūkuluokahiki	Ruled from Hawaiʻi all the way to Kūkuluokahiki[101]
ʻAʻoe kūʻai ʻia kou pono i ka haole	Your rights have never been traded away to foreigners
Eia nō ʻoe i ka ʻōuli o ka lanakila	Here you are with all the symbols of victory
I ka ʻāina makuahine o Kalani	In the motherland of the Royal One
He lani ʻo Kalanikaumaka[a]mano	A heavenly one is Kalanikaumakaamano[102]
He mano Kalani	The Royal One is four-thousandfold,
he lau ka liko aliʻi	the chiefly buds are four-hundredfold
ʻO ke aliʻi kū kapu ʻoe ka lālani	You are the sacred one of the lineage
ʻO ke kalo pele kei kū i ka lā	Like the choicest, finest kalo standing in the sun
ʻO ka lā hānau muli no ka mahina	The sun is a younger sibling to the first-born moon
No ke kupua i loko o Keaopolohiwa	From the extraordinary being in Keaopolohiwa[103]
He hiwa ʻo Kalani, he milimili na ka wohi	The Royal One is a choice one, a precious one for the wohi[104]
Na ka pua lani o Hawaiʻi ke ō ē oh	By the heavenly blossom[105] of Hawaiʻi, the calling,
E ō ē	Do respond, yes

[98] *He Lei no ʻEmalani: Chants for Queen Emma Kaleleonālani*, edited by M. Puakea Nogelmeier, (Honolulu, Hawaiʻi, The Queen Emma Foundation and Bishop Museum Press, 2001), 176-183. *Original source:* HLM. 65 (Bishop Museum, Mele Book 65), p. 35.
[99] Nogelmeier, *He Lei no ʻEmalani*, 176.
[100] Nogelmeier footnote: Probably a reference to Kūkāʻilimoku, 'Kū, snatcher of islands,' the war god of Kamehameha.
[101] Nogelmeier footnote: The boundaries foreign lands; the far horizon.
[102] Nogelmeier footnote: Honorific name for Emma; literally 'The royal one beloved by the multitude'.
[103] Nogelmeier footnote: Literally, 'The dark purple-black cloud,' a form of the god Kāne.
[104] Nogelmeier footnote: High rank of chiefly status, below *nīʻaupiʻo*, mentioned later.
[105] Nogelmeier footnote: Or 'offspring.'

These opening lines are incredibly pointed and boastful. Emma is referred to as "ka wahine noho aupuni" (the one who rules the nation), despite not being the actual mōʻī. The line "'Aʻoe kūʻai…" is a direct barb towards Kalākaua, who Emma and many others saw as a sell-out to the Americans due to the Reciprocity Treaty. Emma is also compared to the choicest kalo, the sacred staple of Kānaka ʻŌiwi. The origin of the kalo is traced in the *Kumulipo* cosmology.

Here are lines from the closing of the mele[106]:

ʻO ʻoe kā hoʻi ka lani nana e noho ka hoʻokuʻi o luna	You, indeed, are the heavenly one who shall reign at the junction on high
Ka papakū o ka honua	At the very foundation of the earth
ʻAʻohe mea nana e hōʻoni	There is nothing that could disturb it
E hoʻonāueue ai ʻo ke aupuni	That could shake the nation
Ka pūkoʻa kū o ke kai hohonu	The upright coral mound of the deep ocean
Ua mākia ʻia e ke au miki, e ke au kā	Anchored by the outgoing current, the striking current
Kau aʻela ka lanakila iā ʻEmalani	Victory is placed upon Emmalani
I ka mea nona ke poʻo o ke aupuni	Upon the one for whom is the head of the nation
Kū hae kalauna lā, hoʻokau ʻia.	Your crown flag there, let it be flown.

This last verse reaffirmed that Emma was the rightful leader of the Kingdom. She was compared to "ka pūkoʻa kū" (the upright coral mound), which is immovable and steadfast in the ocean currents. Again, Emma is victorious and is "ke poʻo o ke aupuni" (the head of the nation).

Due to the length of "Kūwahine Hā Kou Inoa", all 196 lines could not be reviewed in this section. However, there are some key characteristics and themes of this mele that should be noted. The mele is structured in a call and response style. Certain verses end with the call phrase "E ō ē" (Do respond, yes); the first line of the verse that follows is always "Ō mai ʻEmalani, ke aliʻi nona ia inoa" (Emmalani responds, the chiefess for whom is the name). Another example of repetition in the mele are variations of the phrase "kō hae kalaunu, hoʻokau ʻia" (your crown flag, it is flown/hoisted), which appear at the ending of several verses.

ʻĀina is the most common theme in the mele. It is manifested in numerous references to specific place names and natural features (winds, rains, plants, etc.). The body of the mele actually moves from island to island, from Oʻahu, to Kauaʻi, Maui, and Hawaiʻi. The Hawaiʻi Island verses are the most extensive because Emma's lineage as a Kamehameha is rooted in Hawaiʻi Island. The mele goes beyond the pae ʻāina (archipelago) encompassing the lands of

[106] Nogelmeier, *He Lei no ʻEmalani*, 183.

Kahiki, which is twice referenced. ʻĀina is critical because it represented the domain of what could be ruled by Emma, spanning from Kahiki to Hawaiʻi. Within the pae ʻāina, the mele focused on the four "main" islands and the distinguishing characteristics of each. This is reminiscent of the moʻolelo of *Hiʻiakaikapoliopele*, in the way that Hiʻiaka demonstrated her knowledge of ʻāina in her various mele and oli that she presented along her journey. The invocation of ʻāina knowledge in both "Kūwahine Hā Kou Inoa" and *Hiʻiakaikapoliopele* was a way to be inclusive and gain the respect of those who were kamaʻāina to those places.

The second theme in this mele is the reference to both aliʻi and akua. Emma herself is called by several different names throughout the mele, such as "Kūwahine" in the opening line. The names of her father, Nāʻea, and mother, Kekelaokalani were placed in the mele in order to call upon her aliʻi lineages. Other aliʻi kaulana (famous aliʻi) such as Manokalanipō of Kauaʻi, Kamalālāwalu of Maui, Keawe of Hawaiʻi, and Kalaninuiʻīmamao are named. Because these are aliʻi kaulana, their names would be easily recognized by any listener. Many akua are alluded to as well, such as Wākea and Papa, along with their daughter Hoʻohōkūkalani, who are the progenitors of both ʻāina and kānaka. The mele claimed Emma as a royal descendent from their lineage.[107] This is a claim that Kalākaua also made in their earlier genealogical battles. In the Hawaiʻi Island section, the mele named two akua of Mauna Kea, Poliʻahu and Kūkahauʻula.[108] The line "Kau pono i Halemaʻumaʻu ke ahi a ka wahine" (Set right at Halemaʻumaʻu is the fire of the woman) is a reference to the fires of Pele at Halemaʻumaʻu.[109]

There is no doubt that Emma's huakaʻi to Mauna Kea in 1882 was her response to political climate of the Kingdom and her distaste of Kalākaua. This journey was really the last political huakaʻi (literally and figuratively) that Emma embarked on as her health deteriorated over the next couple years, resulting in her passing in 1885. Between 1883 to 1885, Emma was less visible in the political forefront as compared to the previous decade, although her supporters that continued to be active. In 1883, there was one last genealogical battle between Kalākaua's supporters and the Emmaites. This challenge was sparked because Emma, along with Pauahi and Keʻelikolani, did not attend Kalākaua's coronation ceremony. This further drew the ire of Liliʻuokalani. The genealogical battle was "fought" in the nūpepa, as both sides traded barbs and

[107] Nogelmeier, *He Lei no ʻEmalani*, 177.
[108] Nogelmeier, *He Lei no ʻEmalani*, 180.
[109] Nogelmeier, *He Lei no ʻEmalani*, 182.

insults over the course of several months.[110] Nothing truly came about as a result of the genealogical fighting, but it showed that Emma still had loyal followers.

"A Change of Scene to Forget Sorrow", Lili'uokalani Goes to Boston, 1896-1897

When Lili'uokalani became mō'ī in 1891, she took on a title that had been stripped of power and inherited a kingdom that was starting to fray. Four years prior, her brother Kalākaua had been forced to sign the Bayonet Constitution, which shifted power away from the mō'ī and gave power to the legislature and cabinet. With the mō'ī held in check by an oppositional legislature and cabinet, the wealthy Euro-American population of Hawai'i benefitted greatly.

As Lili'u tried to restore her throne through legal means, some royalists felt that it was the time for action. In the aftermath of Robert W. Kalanihiapo Wilcox's 1895 rebellion, a stash of weapons was "found" on the grounds of Lili'uokalani's home. Accused of knowing about the weapons and the royalists' plan, Lili'u was sentenced to eight months of imprisonment in 'Iolani Palace.

In 1896, Lili'u completed her sentence and was released. Understandably, she was mentally and spiritually drained from her experience over the past year. After being cooped up in a room for months, Lili'u needed "a change of scene to forget sorrow", which she titled the chapter in her autobiography. She wrote that she "felt greatly inclined to go abroad, it made no difference where, as long as it would be a change."[111] Lili'u explained that in order to leave the country, she had to ask permission from Sanford B. Dole, president of the Republic. She informed him that she wished go to San Francisco and Boston, and possibly on to England to visit her niece (and heir) Princess Ka'iulani.[112] Dole permitted her travel, although he warned her about traveling to Boston because winter was coming.[113] Lili'u's writing depicted the situation as cordial but there was an underlying sense of disrespect. She was an ali'i yet she had to ask Dole, a commoner, to do something that she would have otherwise needed no permission for. In

[110] Kanahele, *Emma*, 357-358.
[111] Lili'uokalani, 305.
[112] Princess Ka'iulani was the daughter of Miriam Likelike and Archibald S. Cleghorn. She passed in 1899, a year after Hawai'i was "annexed", at the age of 23. Lili'u never visited England because Ka'iulani decided to come home.
[113] Lili'uokalani, 305-306.

reality, it was a condescending situation. After waving goodbye from the deck of the ship, Lili‘u expressed, “for the first time in years I drew a long breath of freedom.”[114]

Lili‘uokalani rode the famous *Sunset Limited* train, which ran between Los Angeles and New Orleans. While staring through the window at the North American landscape, Lili‘u provided one of the most enthralling reflections on American imperialism, land, and power. She wrote:

> Miles after miles of *rich* country went by as we gazed from the windows of the moving train, and all this *vast* extent of territory which we traversed belonged to the United States; and there were many other routes from the Pacific to the Atlantic with an equally *boundless panorama*. *Here were thousands of acres of uncultivated, uninhabited, but rich and fertile lands, soil capable of producing anything which grows*, plenty of water, floods of it running to waste, everything needed for pleasant towns and quiet homesteads, *except population*. The view and thoughts awakened brought forcibly to mind that humanity was the one element needed to open to usefulness and enjoyment these rich tracts of lands. *Colonies and colonies could be established here, and never interfere with each other in the least, the vast extent of unoccupied land is so enormous*. I thought what splendid sugar plantations might here be established, how easily and profitably rice might be grown, and in some other spots with what good returns coffee could be planted. *There was nothing lacking in this great, rich country save the people to settle upon it, and develop its wealth*.[115]

In this part of her observation, Lili‘u turned the imperial gaze back upon its self. She used several of the exact words and phrases as white travel writers, such as “panorama”, “vast”, “uncultivated”, and “uninhabited”. Whereas travel writers viewed and wrote about the Hawaiian land as being empty, unused landscape waiting to be possessed, it was as if Lili‘u was holding up a mirror so Uncle Sam could see his own reflection. She saw North American land as having everything capable of supporting large populations. This land was also fertile enough to raise sugar cane, the very crop that had fractured the Hawaiian Kingdom. She continued:

> And yet this great and powerful nation must go across two thousand miles of sea, and take from the poor Hawaiians their little spots in the Broad Pacific, must covet our islands of Hawaii nei, and extinguish the nationality of my poor people, many of whom have now not a foot of land

[114] Lili‘uokalani, 306.
[115] Lili‘uokalani, 309-310. Italicization my own.

> which can be called their own. And for what? *In order that another race-problem shall be injected into the social and political perplexities with which the United States in the great experiment of popular government is already struggling?* in order that a novel and inconsistent foreign and colonial policy shall be grafted upon its hitherto impregnable diplomacy? or in order that a friendly and generous, yet proud-spirited and sensitive race, shall be crushed under the weight of a social order and prejudice with each *even another century of preparation would hardly fit it to cope?*[116]

Here, Liliʻu harshly condemned American settler colonialism, racism, imperialism and foreign policy. She had witnessed the disenfranchisement of Kānaka ʻŌiwi who had "not a foot of land" due to settler colonialism. Liliʻu recognized that the United States' social and political systems were problematic. How could a foreign social and political system, let alone a flawed one, be imposed or "grafted" upon Hawaiʻi? Liliʻu knew that if the U.S. extended its "experiment" to Hawaiʻi, Native Hawaiians would be "crushed". The final line is quite prophetic as Liliʻu predicted that not even "another century of preparation" could ready Hawaiʻi and Kānaka ʻŌiwi for American colonialism.

Re-visiting Huakaʻi: Kānaka ʻŌiwi Travel

It is clear that Kānaka ʻŌiwi travel is an integral part of Hawaiian history. Kānaka have always been in motion, whether exploring Kahiki or making circuits of the archipelago. The multitude of themes discussed in this chapter are examples of the importance of re-visiting moʻolelo huakaʻi. The earliest accounts of migration and voyaging chiefs record explorations beyond Hawaiʻi, sustained contact with foreigners, the restoration of aliʻi lineages, and cultural exchanges. In *Hiʻiakaikapoliopele*, Pele and Hiʻiaka assumed the role of malihini. Pele and her family were from Kahiki but migrated and settled throughout the Hawaiian Islands. The protocols of hoʻokipa were a major theme in Hiʻiaka's circuit through the archipelego as she sought to establish relationships with various creatures, peoples, and ʻāina.

Moʻolelo huakaʻi spanned into the 19th century as diplomatic missions were necessary to gain international recognition of the Hawaiian Kingdom's sovereignty. The two diplomatic missions in the 1840s were both affected by experiences of American racism. Both parties realized that in America, race trumped status. This had major implications as Alexander Liholiho

[116] Liliʻuokalani, 310. Italicization my own.

and Lota Kapuāiwa shaped their domestic policies based on their American experience. In turn, their anti-American, pro-British policies were criticized in the writings of American travelers. For Kalākaua and Emma, travel provided a means of uplifting their respective genealogies and gaining political support. Kalākaua's world trip was important in further establishing diplomatic relations between the Kingdom and other nations. It also stirred up Kalākaua's antagonism towards Christianity in Hawai'i, and perhaps his desire to reinvigorate Hawaiian cultural practices. Emma used travel to show Kalākaua that despite his victory, she was still loved by many maka'āinana. In the last mo'olelo huaka'i, Lili'uokalani left Hawai'i to temporarily escape from the occupying government. Traveling across the U.S. inspired her poignant reflection upon American imperialism and the fate of her beloved homeland and people.

Returning to the mo'olelo huaka'i of Kānaka 'Ōiwi raises and perhaps begins to answer several pressing questions. What did travel mean to Kānaka within specific contexts? In what ways did travel shape or inform how Kānaka viewed themselves in relation to Hawai'i and/or foreign spaces. How do mo'olelo huaka'i counter colonial and imperial narratives? Lastly, by considering mo'olelo huaka'i as a "genre", how does it compare to Western travel writing? Can the "genre" be defined? This chapter is merely just a sliver from the surface of these accounts. By compiling Kānaka travel accounts, especially those of maka'āinana, through additional research there will be greater evidence for addressing these questions.

-Epilogue-
Ka Hoʻi (The Return)

Haole plover
plundering the archipelagoes
of our world

And we, gorging ourselves
on lost shells
blowing a tourist conch

into the wounds of catastrophe.

–Haunani-Kay Trask, "Hawaiʻi", in *Light in the Crevice Never Seen*

Like the kōlea who return to their homeland after their arduous cross-migration, this historical endeavor has also come to its end (for now). I have trekked through the centuries of human travel, from ancient Greece to 19th century Hawaiʻi: wars, quests, pilgrimage, exodus, migration, diplomacy, etc. Travel accounts (both oral and written) are a record of human movement and behavior, both great and small. These accounts supply insight into how storytellers saw themselves or their culture in relation to foreign places and peoples. Additionally, accounts shape the readers' perception of themselves in relation to the traveler's experience of "Otherness". When narrative themes are repeated, reproduced, and recycled they eventually come to be understood as truth, for both producers and consumers.

As I have argued in this thesis, the narrative themes in late 19th century travel writing produced an "Imagined Hawaiʻi" for the consumption of white visitors and settlers in the newly forming travel industry. In Chapter 1, "Modes and Motives: A History of Movement", I reviewed the long history of Western produced travel writing, from pilgrimages to scientific exploration to the Grand Tour. This complex history gives context to the literary style of and narratives in travel writing produced by Westerners about Hawaiʻi. The narratives found in Hawaiʻi travel writing can be categorized by two themes: landscape and Kānaka ʻŌiwi. These two themes shape the "Imagined Hawaiʻi" for the consumption of readers and other travelers.

In Chapter 2, "Producing Paradise", I focused on the "Imagined Hawaiʻi" of the 1870s. Three major themes are found in this selection of travel writing: progress, civility, and extinction. In this time, writers saw the "Imagined Hawaiʻi" as a picturesque landscape where mostly-civilized natives lived in harmony with a growing Euro-American population. Visitors would feel comfortable with the Hawaiian Kingdom advancing infrastructure and Honolulu's

metropolitan feel. The decline of the Native Hawaiian population left Hawai‘i with an uncertain destiny, perhaps to be inherited by its Euro-American citizens. Two decades later, “Imagined Hawai‘i” took on a much more political meaning for travel writers.

In Chapter 3, “Pilikia in Paradise”, I exhibited how travel writing was an integral tool in rationalizing American colonialism and imperialism during the course of the 1890s. The three major themes in this selection of travel writing were the 3 Ps: progress, protection, and popularity. In the 1890s version of the “Imagined Hawai‘i”, the previously held criticisms of Kānaka ‘Ōiwi were redirected toward the Hawaiian monarchy. Ali‘i, such as Kalākaua and Lili‘uokalani, were portrayed as so unfit to rule that the Euro-American elite needed to take control and “protect” Kānaka from monarchial “oppression”. By writing revisionist accounts of political histories, travel writers created an “Imagined Hawai‘i” that was political propaganda for American imperialism. Thus, the destiny of Hawai‘i was no longer uncertain, Hawai‘i was America’s inheritance.

As Matthew Frye Jacobson stated in *Barbarian Virtues*, colonial travel narratives “rendered exotic lands according to their potential as redeemed territories either colonized by or annexed to ‘civilization.’”[1] This statement is at the core of the “Imagined Hawai‘i” in both the 1870s and 1890s. In the 1870s, the chances of Hawai‘i becoming American was unlikely, but many people were looking towards the future. When a real chance at American annexation opened post-1893, writers such as Oleson, Stevens, and Whitney used travel writing to advertise Hawai‘i’s readiness and willingness to become American. With a Euro-American controlled government and a Native Hawaiian population that was “civilized”, Hawai‘i was a prime candidate for America’s imperial reach.

In the essay, “Travel and Unsettlement: Freud on Vacation”, Brian Musgrove argued that travel writing is a tool of imperialism, and travel allows for the “colonial adventure”. He also insisted that travel writing should be thought of as an archive “for investigating colonizing processes, providing rich source material on the formations of western subjectivities out of the encounter with imagined others”; these writings “expose transactions of cultural and political power.”[2] These subjectivities are expressed both blatantly and subtly. The legacy of the

[1] Jacobson, 112.
[2] Brian Musgrove, “Travel and Unsettlement: Freud on Vacation,” in *Travel Writing and Empire: Postcolonial Theory in Transit*. Edited by Steve Clark. (New York: Zed Books, 1999), 32-33.

"Imagined Hawai'i" produced in the 19th century continues to survive, constructing the perception of Hawai'i and its people in more recent decades.

In Chapter 4, "Hele Aku, Ho'i Mai: Re-visiting Mo'olelo Huaka'i", I shifted away from travel writing produced by Euro-American and British authors in order to focus on mo'olelo huaka'i of Kānaka 'Ōiwi. I argued that this is an overlooked area in travel discourse, as scholars tend to focus on foreigners' travels to Hawai'i. With the small selection of mo'olelo in Chapter 4, it is already apparent that there are common themes and trends threaded through these accounts. By conducting further research, the richness of these mo'olelo huaka'i will add great wealth to the study of Hawaiian history and culture.

"State History" and Other Myths

The contemporary vision (post-1959) of the "Imagined Hawai'i" relies on the watered down, popular history of Hawai'i—Hawai'i "state history". The history of the State of Hawai'i follows a particular historical trajectory that romanticizes (and pacifies) Native Hawaiians while conveniently mis-remembering how exactly Hawai'i became an American state (a direct extension of the 1890s). The way that state history is recited frames statehood as the ultimate and logical progression of Hawai'i, echoing the narratives of progress in 19th century travel writing.

State history begins with Capt. Cook "discovering" Hawai'i and Kamehameha unifying the islands (as if he foresaw Hawai'i becoming a state). Then the ABCFM brought the glorious benefits of Christianity, civilizing the poor, brown heathens and savages. The narrative skips to the end of the century, romanticizing Kalākaua and Lili'u as the last monarchs of Hawai'i. Again, the narrative conveniently jumps ahead into the territorial era, ignoring the politics of the 1890s. The territorial era (1900-1959) is marked by the nostalgic reminiscences of the plantation (sugar and pineapple) days, as well as war. The plantation era created a harmonious "melting pot" of cultures in Hawai'i. With the outbreak of World War II was the persecution of local Japanese, who proved themselves to be loyal Americans after volunteering their military service; and who rose to political power post-WWII. The apex of Hawai'i's state history was the achievement of statehood in 1959, officially becoming the "Aloha State" (a marketing strategy for mass tourism).

The state history of Hawai'i is a colonial history that aligns itself with American imperialism. It is an easy to digest version of history for people who are ignorant of Hawaiian

history, or are actively avoiding reality. Words and phrases that are commonly associated with Hawai‘i, such as “melting pot” and “aloha spirit”, help to reinforce colonial narratives and state history. These two terms are also important to the travel industry’s effort to maintain a reputation as a welcoming locale: the “Imagined Hawai‘i”.

In the Introduction, “Ka Ha‘alele (The Departure)”, I discussed two examples of scholarship about Hawai‘i’s contemporary travel industry, David J. Baker’s “*Ea* and Knowing in Hawai‘i” (1997) and RDK Herman’s “The Aloha State: Place Names and the Anti-Conquest of Hawai‘i” (1999). As I have previously stated, looking towards the past is imperative to the understanding of the present and future. The narrative themes established in the early travel writing manifest themselves in contemporary forms.

In Julie Kaomea’s article, “A Curriculum of Aloha? Colonialism and Tourism in Hawai‘i’s Elementary Textbooks” (2000), Kaomea revealed that the heavy influence of the travel industry had permeated the educational system of Hawai‘i. As part of her study, Kaomea analyzed Hawaiian Studies textbooks used by the Hawai‘i Department of Education, primarily the text *Hawaii, the Aloha State* by Helen Bauer (1982). She pointed out that the name of the textbook shared its name with numerous books relating to tourism.[3] The textbook was also formatted with similar elements to travel guide books and tourism advertisements; it was divided into sections and sub-sections by islands and attractions. Additionally, Kaomea likened the photographs in the book to “scenic postcard advertisements”; in fact, the photos were from the Hawai‘i Visitors Bureau (HVB).[4]

Kaomea also interviewed elementary school children and asked them to describe Native Hawaiians. According to the students, Hawaiians ‘[wear] different [costumes]’ and ‘play nice music’; they are ‘kind’ and the ‘nicest people’. In a visual representation of a Hawaiian female, one of the children drew a stereotypical “hula girl”.[5] As Kaomea stated, “While such descriptions of Native Hawaiians as good-natured primitives might be expected from students in the United States mainland, they are particularly puzzling when coming from children in modern-day

[3] Julie Kaomea, “A Curriculum of Aloha? Colonialism and Tourism in Hawai‘i’s Elementary Textbooks,” *Curriculum Inquiry* 30 no. 3, (2000), 325.
[4] Kaomea, 326.
[5] Kaomea, 320.

Hawai‘i, many of whom are Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian themselves.”[6] This is reminiscent of the narratives from the 1890s which depicted Kānaka ‘Ōiwi as harmless natives.

In the third part of the article, Kaomea argued that educational initiatives also incorporated touristic qualities and reinforced the narrative that Hawai‘i’s citizens are obligated to be “ambassadors of aloha”.[7] She compared a Hawaiian Studies curriculum guide to a tour guide manual; both required knowledge of geography and notable attractions. In one of the activities from the curriculum guide, students needed to plan a “five-day tour of one of the Hawaiian islands for a visitor traveling from the United states or any other country for the first time.”[8] From an early age, Hawai‘i’s students are being ingrained in the culture of tourism (“host culture”), training them to be hospitable without question.

This type of hospitality is not the same ho‘okipa as expressed in the mo‘olelo of *Hi‘iakaikapoliopele* and various ‘ōlelo no‘eau (Chapter 4). Although the weight of ho‘okipa is mostly on the host, the relationship is still reciprocal and bounded by protocol. Hospitality in the tourism industry occurs only in one direction, from host to visitor. As in the kōlea metaphor, visitors are allowed to partake in unlimited, unchecked consumption before returning home. Although Kaomea proposed solutions that would make the Hawaiian Studies curriculum more culturally appropriate and sensitive, she ultimately believed that “none of these changes are likely to occur on a large scale in a state and educational system which remains ignorant of or indifferent to Native Hawaiian concerns.”[9] Obviously, things have not changed much, as in the example of the HTA campaign commanding citizens to be more welcoming and supportive towards tourism (Introduction).

In Jocelyn Linnekin’s “Consuming Cultures: Tourism and the Commoditization of Cultural Identity in the Island Pacific” (1997), Linnekin explored the marketing and economics of tourism in relation to Native Hawaiian culture and Native Hawaiian issues. She stated that the success of Hawai‘i’s economy comes at “the price of indigenous dispossession, wholesale transformation, and cultural loss, not to mention a high cost of living…tourism has been

[6] Kaomea, 320.
[7] Kaomea, 338.
[8] Kaomea, 338.
[9] Kaomea, 340.

defended as the only alternative for generating jobs and state tax revenues."[10] Like Baker and Herman, Linnekin criticized the myth of "ethnic harmony", and noted that issues such as Hawaiian sovereignty have threatened this perceived ethnic harmony.[11] This myth is mostly driven by the "melting pot" narrative birthed out of Hawai'i's plantation era.[12]

Keiko Ohnuma's "'Aloha Spirit' and the Cultural Politics of Sentiment as National Belonging" (2008) is yet another critique of how the concept of "host culture" hurts Hawai'i and Native Hawaiians. Ohnuma traced the history of the so-called "aloha spirit", from the ABCFM to mass tourism to state idealogy. She explained that in the 1980s, Native Hawaiian activists and scholars started to expose and challenge the myth of the melting pot, which is a marketing point for the tourism industry. Ohnuma further contended that differences in economic and social statuses between different ethnic groups in Hawai'i are blended "under the banner of multicultural harmony, and partitioning political discourse according to moral mandates to 'show aloha'."[13]

In "'Hawaiian at Heart' and Other Fictions" (2005), Lisa Kahaleole Hall discussed the politics of Hawaiian identity and how identity and culture have been distorted. She held the post-annexation tourism industry as responsible for cultural commodification on a large scale.[14] Kahaleole Hall argued that, "tourism and entertainment have been the vectors of information exchange between the island and the continent. The history and colonization unfamiliar to most non-Hawaiians."[15] The success of the travel industry depends on the ignorance of travelers and

[10] Jocelyn S. Linnekin, Consuming Cultures: Tourism and the Commoditization of Cultural Identity in the Island Pacific," in *Tourism, Ethnicity and the State in Asian and Pacific Studies* edited by Michel Picard and Robert E Wood, 215-250, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997, 220.
[11] Linnekin, 228.
[12] In the article, "Think of Hawai'i as a Racial Volcano", Ethnic Studies scholar Roderick Labrador stated, "some residents have an allergic reaction to talking about both contemporary racism *and* colonialism. This resistance perpetuates a violence against Native Hawaiians, because it forces them to disappear; they're incorporated as just another racial minority group, not recognized as people who have a different historical relationship to the and to the state." Roderick Labrador, "Think of Hawaii as a Racial Volcano", *Honolulu Civil Beat*, published October 7, 2015, website, accessed April 2016. For more on the myth of racial harmony and the effects of settler colonialism, see: Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Y. Okamura, ed. *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai'i.* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008).
[13] Keiko Ohnuma, "'Aloha Spirit' and the Cultural Politics of Sentiment as National Belonging," *The Contemporary Pacific* 20, no. 2 (2008), 374.
[14] Lisa Kahaleole Hall, "'Hawaiian at Heart' and Other Fictions," *The Contemporary Pacific* 17, no. 2, (2005), 408.
[15] Hall, 405.

the pacification of the history of colonial violence, just as travel writers in the 1890s re-framed historical events to rationalize American imperialism.[16]

Marketing and advertisements through the 20th and in the 21st century rely heavily on kitsch: tacky aloha shirts, tiki bars, hula girl figurines, cellophane skirts and coconut bras, pineapple pizza (known as "Hawaiian" pizza), etc. Kahaleole Hall stated that the absurdity of kitsch:

> functions to undermine sovereignty struggles in a very fundamental way. A culture without dignity cannot be conceived of as having sovereign rights, and the repeated marketing of kitsch Hawaiian-ness leads to non-Hawaiians' misunderstanding and degradation of Hawaiian culture and history. Bombarded by such kitsch along with images of leisure and paradise, non-Hawaiians fail to take Hawaiian sovereignty seriously and Hawaiian activism remains invisible to the mainstream.[17]

The lack of seriousness given to Hawai'i has directly affected both Kahaleole Hall and her academic colleague, J Kēhaulani Kauanui, in their respective professional careers. As scholars who work on the continental U.S., both were questioned when they wrote grants to fund Hawai'i-based research, as if they were just trying to scoop a free vacation.[18] This type of stigmatization is not an isolated occurance. In 2011, Hawai'i hosted the Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) summit, which involved some of the world's top leaders, including U.S. President Barack Obama. A mini controversy arose in regards to the APEC summit's official photoshoot; traditionally the leaders wore the cultural attire of the locale. President Obama chose to end the tradition; it was popularly speculated that the wardrobe change was to "avoid the appearence of world leaders acting frivolous during a time of economic austerity."[19] This stigmatization is perhaps relatable to the narratives of "laziness" and "leisure" expressed by 19th century writers.

In Chapter 2, "Producing Paradise", I explained that travel writers who subscribed to the "Imagined Hawai'i" were confronted by the realities of their experiences. These incidents happened when Kānaka 'Ōiwi did not conform to their roles prescribed by the "Imagined Hawai'i". As the previous examples of contemporary scholarship have shown, the travel industry

[16] Kahaleole Hall added, "Authors of high school social studies textbooks remain content to tell a story of the happy fiftieth state, whose diverse peoples are full of aloha, engaged in tourism, and growing pineapples.", 405-406.
[17] Hall, 409.
[18] Hall, 409.
[19] Dan Nakaso and B. J. Reyes, "No aloha for Hawaiian shirts at APEC family photo," Honolulu Star-Advertiser, published October 13, 2011, accessed August 2016.

is dependent on Native Hawaiians living up to the stereotype of "happy natives": welcoming, hospitable, exotic yet American. Being "Hawaiian" is to embody the so-called aloha spirit; when in reality, "aloha spirit" is a subversive phrase for hospitality, servtitude, and passivity.

In the op-ed piece "Aloha Denied" (2014) by historians Noelani Arista and Judy Kertesz, the writers discussed how colonial narratives perpetuated throughout the course of history actively silence Native Hawaiians who challenge or reject colonialism. The premise of their discussion stemmed from a 2014 videotape of a confrontation between a young homeless Hawaiian man and a recently-settled haole couple at a beach park on Maui. After witnessing the Hawaiian man allegedly mistreat a dog, the husband ("John Doe") confronted the Hawaiian man about his behavior. In response, the Hawaiian man approached them and told them to mind their own business, and proceeded to go on a rant. The videotape of the confrotation was posted online and went "viral", garnering many responses.[20]

As Arista and Kertesz explained, many (including other Kānaka) accused the young man of not being "Hawaiian" because his outburst towards the couple was considered to be "un-Hawaiian"(no aloha spirit). The haole couple stated that they had always been shown "aloha" by locals since they had moved to Hawai'i. Colonialism allows foreigners to expect the aloha spirit; however, as the authors argued, Kānaka 'Ōiwi have every right to deny aloha to foreigners:

> The romanticism of a colonized island-paradise with its eternal promise of aloha alongside expressions of revulsion toward Native people who refuse to give aloha informs John Doe's video. For hundreds of years, tourists travelled, and settlers moved to our islands because they wanted to live in 'paradise'. From Captain Cook and Mark Twain to James Michener and 'John Doe,' Hawaii is an *idea* of paradise more than it is a place. But if Europeans dreamed of paradise populated by aloha-giving innocents, they also feared the savage who lurked on its fringes.[21]

It is imperitive to critique and de-construct the "Imagined Hawai'i", whether through the analysis of historical travel writing, re-visiting indigenous modes of travel, or addressing contemporary issues. In order to improve and advance the discipline of Hawaiian history, we must be the anarchic savages that the colonial narrative fears. But instead of lurking in the fringes of academia, we must to continue to stand our ground out in the open. When left unchallenged and

[20] Noelani Arista and Judy Kertesz, "Aloha Denied," *The Hawaii Independent*, published Februarty 25, 2014, website, accessed August 2016.
[21] Arista and Kertesz, "Aloha Denied".

unquestioned, the narrative cycle remains unbroken, just as the kōlea complete their migratory circuit year after year. Hawai‘i exists, the “Imagined” does not. Taking a page from the life story of Emma Nākuina, the production of history must be negotiated on our own terms.

Pau.

-Appendix A-
Listing of ʻŌlelo Noʻeau

This is a list of ʻōlelo noʻeau I gathered in my research, including those found in this thesis, as well as ʻōlelo noʻeau that I left out due to length. All ʻōlelo below are directly from Mary Kawena Pukui's *ʻŌlelo Noʻeau: Hawaiian Proverbs and Poetical Sayings.* I loosely categorized the ʻōlelo by theme, and include the identification number and page number.

On kōlea:

Aia kēkē na hulu o ka umauma hoʻi ke kōlea i Kahiki e hānau ai.
When the feathers on the breast darken [because of fatness] the plover goes back to Kahiki to breed.
A person comes here, grows prosperous, and goes away without a thought to the source of his prosperity. ON 56, p12.

ʻAi no ke kōlea a momona hoʻi i Kahiki.
The plover eats until fat, then returns to the land from which it came.
Said of a foreigner who comes to Hawaiʻi, makes money, and departs to his homeland to enjoy his wealth. ON 86, p12.

Kōlea kau āhua, a uliuli ka umauma hoʻi i Kahiki.
Plover that perches on the mound, wait till its breast darkens, then departs for Kahiki.
The darkening of the breast is a sign that a plover is fat. It flies to these islands from Alaska in the fall and departs in the spring, arriving thin and hungry and departing fat. Applied to a person who comes here, acquires wealth, and departs. ON 182, p22.

On foreigners:

I Kahiki no ka hao, o ke kiʻo ana i Hawaiʻi nei.
In Kahiki was the iron; in Hawaiʻi, the rusting.
Perhaps the foreigner was a good person while he was at home, but here he grows careless with his behavior. ON 1179, p128.

Lawe liʻiliʻi ka make a ka Hawaiʻi, lawe nui ka make a ka haole.
Death by Hawaiians takes a few at a time; death by foreigners takes many.
The diseases that were known in the islands before the advent of foreigners caused fewer deaths than those that were introduced. ON 1960, p211.

On hoʻokipa:

E mālama i ka ʻōlelo, i kuleana e kipa mai ai.
Remember the invitation, for it gives you the privilege of coming here.
A person feels welcome when accepting an invitation and friendly promises. ON 348, p42.

He ʻai leo ʻole, he ʻīpuka hāmama.
Food unaccompanied by a voice; a door always open.
Said about a home of a hospitable person. The food can be eaten without hearing a complaint from the owners, and the door is never closed to any visitor. ON 518, p61.

Hoʻokahi no lā o ka malihini.
A stranger only for a day.
After the first day as a guest, one must help with the work. ON 1078, p115.

Na ka puaʻa e ʻai; a na ka puaʻa ana paha e ʻai.
[It is] for the pigs to eat; and perhaps the pigs will taste [you].
A reminder to be hospitable to strangers. From the following story: A missionary and two Hawaiian companioons arrived hungry and tired in Keonepoko, Puna, after walking a long distance. Seeing some natives removing cooked breadfruit from an *imu*, they asked if they could have some. "No," said the natives, "it is for the pigs to eat." So the visitors moved on. Not long after, leprosy broke out among the people of Puna. The first to contract it wer taken to Oʻahu and later sent on to Kalaupapa. Others died at home and were buried. When the last ones finally died, there was no one to bury them, and the pigs feasted on their bodies. Thus, justice was served. ON 2232, p244.

O kuʻu wahi ōpū weuweu la, nou ia.
Let my little clump of grass by yours.
A humble way of offering the use of one's grass house to a friend. ON 2476, p270.

ʻAʻohe hale i piha i ka hoihoi; haʻawi mai a lawe aku no.
No house has a perpetual welcome; it is given and it is taken away.
A warning not to wear out one's welcome. ON 138, p18.

Kiʻi ʻia aku ko ʻai i kiʻona.
Go and recover your food from the dung heap.
Said in disgust and anger to one who complains of the amount of food another has eaten, or of the number of times another has eaten one's food. ON 1790, p192.

He ʻohu kolo ka makani, haʻukeke kamahele.
The wind that brings the creeping for causes the traveler to shiver.
Anger and squabbles in the home of a host chill the spirit of the guest. ON 853, p93.

Kahu i ka lae o ka manō, he ʻale ka wahie.
Kindle a fire on the forehead of a shark with waves for fuel.
Said when food in the *imu* is not cooked because of a lack of firewood. A criticism of the hosts' half-cooked food. ON 1318, p144.

He makamaka, ke pā la kāhea.
That is a friend, for he calls out an invitation.
It was the custom to call out an invitation as a visitor approached. ON 787, p86.

He ola i ka leo kāhea.
There is life in a [hospitable] call.
A call of friendly hospitality gives cheer to the traveler. ON 858, p93.

Mū ka waha heahea ʻole.
Silent is the mouth of the inhospitable.
It is considered rude not to call a welcome to anyone approaching one's home. ON 2196, p239.

He peʻe makaloa.
A hider among makaloa *sedge*.
A stingy person who keeps his eyes downcast while eating lest he see a passerby and be obliged to call him to come and share the meal. ON 889, p96.

Kalaoa ʻai pōʻeleʻele.
Kalaoa eats in the dark.
The people of Kalaoa in east Hilo were noted for their lack of hospitality. To avoid having to ask visitors or passers-by to partake of food with them, they ate in the dark where they could not be seen. ON 1432, p155.

Ua maloʻo ka wai.
The water is dried up.
Said of inhospitality. ON 2828, p310.

Iaia a hiki, make ka puaʻa.
As soon as he arrived, the pig died.
It was the custom to kill and roast a pig when a very welcome guest arrived. ON 1148, p125.

On travel:

Ka wahine pōʻai moku.
The woman who made a circuit of the islands.
Hiʻiaka, who traveled to all of the islands of the Hawaiian group. ON 1645, p178.

Ka lani kaʻapuni honua.
The chief who went around the world.
Kalakaua, who traveled to many lands. ON 1431, p155.

ʻAʻole no i ʻike ke kanaka i na nani o kona wahi i hānau ʻia ai.
A person doesn't see all the beauties of his birthplace. ON 230, p27.

I hoʻokauhua i ke kōlea, no Kahiki ana ke keiki.
When there is a desire for plovers, the child-to-be will travel to Kahiki.
Said of a pregnant woman. If she craves plovers, her child will someday travel to foreign lands.
ON 1167, p127.

Works Cited

"A Young Woman's Chances in Hawaii." *Paradise of the Pacific*. Edited by J. J. Williams. Honolulu, November, 1904.

"A Young Man's Chances in Hawaii." *Paradise of the Pacific*. Edited by J. J. Williams. Honolulu, May, 1903.

Arista, Noelani and Judy Kertesz. "Aloha Denied." *The Hawai'i Independent.* Website. Published February 5, 2014. http://hawaiiindependent.net/story/aloha-denied.

Arista, Noelani. "I ka mo'olelo nō ke ola: In History There is Life." *Anglistica*, 2010.

Bacchilega, Cristina. *Legendary Hawai'i and the Politics of Place: Tradition, Translation, and Tourism.* Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

Baker, David J. "Ea and Knowing in Hawai'i." *Critical Inquiry* 23, no. 3 (1997).

Beamer, Kamanamaikalani. *No Mākou Ka Mana: Liberating the Nation*. Honolulu: Kamehameha Publishing, 2014.

Beardslee, L.A. "Pilikias." *The North American Review*. (1898).

Bird, Isabella. *The Hawaiian Archipelago: Six Months Among the Palm Groves, Coral Reefs, and Volcanoes of the Sandwich Islands.* London: John Murray, 1875.

Bird, Isabella. *The Hawaiian Archipelago: Six Months Among the Palm Groves, Coral Reefs, and Volcanoes of the Sandwich Islands.* London: John Murray, 1876.

Bliss, William Root. *Paradise in the Pacific; A Book of Travel, Adventure, and Facts in the Sandwich Islands*. New York: Sheldon and Company, 1873.

Boston Athenaeum. Website. Accessed December 14, 2015. https://www.bostonathenaeum.org/about/ publications/ selections-acquired-tastes/william-root-bliss-1869-red-tan-shell-cameo-relief-augustus-saint-gaudens.

Buke Mele Lāhui: Book of National Songs. Honolulu, Hawai'i: Hawaiian Historical Society, 2003.

Clark, Steve. *Travel Writing and Empire: Postcolonial Theory in Transit*. New York: Zed Books, 1999.

Cleveland, Grover. President Cleveland's Message. Hawaiian Independence. Website. Accessed December 8, 2013. http://www.hawaii-nation.org/cleveland.html.

de Silva, Kīhei and Mapuana de Silva. “A Maunakea ‘o Kalani.” Kamehameha Schools, 2006. Website. Accessed May, 2016. https://apps.ksbe.edu/kaiwakiloumoku/kaleinamanu/he-aloha-moku-o-keawe/maunakea_o_kalani.

de Silva, Kīhei and Mapuana de Silva. “E Hoʻi ka Nani i Mānā.” Kamehameha Schools, 2006. Website. Accessed May, 2016. https://apps.ksbe.edu/kaiwakiloumoku/kaleinamanu/he-aloha-moku-o-keawe/hoi_ka_nani.

Duensing, Dawn. E. *Hawai‘i’s Scenic Roads: Paving the Way for Tourism in the Islands*. Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press, 2015.

Edwards, Justin D. *Exotic Journeys: Exploring the Erotics of U.S. Travel Literature, 1840-1930.* Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2001.

Eyre, Kawika. “Suppression of Hawaiian Culture at Kamehameha Schools.” *Kamehameha Schools*. Website. Published January 2004. Accessed 2016. https://apps.ksbe.edu/kaiwakiloumoku/ makalii/feature-stories/suppression_of_hawaiian_culture.

“Facts for Hawaiian Homeseekers.” *Paradise of the Pacific*. Edited by J. J. Williams. Honolulu, December, 1906.

Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York: Grove Press, 1967.

Feeney, Paulette C. *Aloha and Allegiance: Imagining America’s Paradise*. Ph.D dissertation. University of Hawaiʻi Mānoa, 2009.

Feeser, Andrea. “Constance Fredericka Gordon Cumming’s “Picturesque” Vision: A Christian, Westernized Hawaiʻi.” *Issues in Travel Writing: Empire, Spectacle, and Displacement.* Edited by Kristi Siegel, New York: Peter Lang, 2002.

Fujikane, Candace and Jonathan Y. Okamura, ed. *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai‘i.* Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press, 2008.

“Gartley Hall”. University of Hawaiʻi Mānoa. Website. Accessed July 2016. http://libweb.hawaii.edu/names/gartley.html.

Hall, Lisa Kahaleole. “’Hawaiian at Heart’ and Other Fictions.” *The Contemporary Pacific* 17, no. 2, (2005).

Hauʻofa, Epeli. “Our Sea of Islands.” In *A New Oceania: Rediscovering Our Sea of Islands*. Edited by Vijay Naidu, Eric Waddell, and Epeli Hauʻofa. Suva: School of Social and Economic Development, The University of the South Pacific, 1993.

Hawaiʻi Tourism Authority. *2014 Research Report*. Hawaiʻi Tourism Authority, 2014.

He Lei no ʻEmalani: Chants for Queen Emma Kaleleonālani. Edited by M. Puakea Nogelmeier. Honolulu, Hawaiʻi. The Queen Emma Foundation and Bishop Museum Press, 2001.

Herman, RDK. "The Aloha State: Place Names and the Anti-Conquest of Hawaiʻi." *Annals Association of American Geographers* 89, no. 1 (1999).

hoʻomanwanui, kuʻualoha. *Voices of Fire: Reviewing the Literary Lei of Pele and Hiʻiaka*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014.

Holt, John Dominis. "On Being Hawaiian." Topgallant Publishing Co. Ltd, 1974.

Hopkins, Jaime Uluwehi. *Hānau Ma Ka Lolo, For the Benefit of Her Race: a portrait of Emma Kaʻilikapuolono Metcalf Beckley Nākuina*. Master's thesis, University of Hawaiʻi Mānoa, 2012.

Imada, Adria L. *Aloha America: Hula Circuits Through the U.S. Empire.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2012.

Inglis, Kerri A. *Maʻi Lepera: Disease and Displacement in Nineteenth-Century Hawaiʻi.* Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press, 2013.

Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917.* New York: Hill and Wang, 2000.

James, John-Gabriel H. *A Lens of Liminality: An Interpretive Biography of Charles Warren Stoddard, 1843-1909*. Master's thesis, University of Hawaii Mānoa, 2004.

The Journal of Prince Alexander Liholiho: The Voyages Made to the United States, England and France in 1849-1850. Edited by Jacob Adler. Honolulu: The University of Hawaii Press/Hawaiian Historical Society, 1967.

Kameʻeleihiwa, Lilikalā. *Native Land and Foreign Desires: Pehea Lā E Pono Ai?* Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992.

Kamakau, Samuel M. *Ruling Chiefs of Hawaiʻi.* Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Press, 1992.

Kamakau, Samuel M. *Ke Kumu Aupuni: ka moʻolelo Hawaiʻi no Kamehameha Ka Naʻi Aupuni a me kāna aupuni i hoʻokumu ai*. Honolulu: ʻAhahui ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi, 1996.

Kanahele, George S. *Emma: Hawaiʻi's Remarkable Queen*. Honolulu, University of Hawaiʻi Press, 1999.

Kaomea, Julie. "A Curriculum of Aloha? Colonialism and Tourism in Hawaiʻi's Elementary Textbooks." *Curriculum Inquiry* 30, no. 3 (2000).

Kaplan, Amy. *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Korte, Barbara. *English Travel Writing from Pilgrimages to Postcolonial Explorations*. Translated by Catherine Matthias. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 2000.

Kuykendall, Ralph. *The Hawaiian Kingdom, vol. 2, 1854-1874, Twenty Critical Years.* Honolulu: University of Hawa'i Press, 1953.

Kuykendall, Ralph. *The Hawaiian Kingdom, vol. 3, 1874-1893, The Kalakaua Dynasty.* Honolulu: University of Hawa'i Press, 1967.

Labrador, Roderick. "Think of Hawaii as a Racial Volcano." *Honolulu Civil Beat*. Published October 7, 2015. Website. Accessed April 2016. http://www.civilbeat.org/connections/think-of-hawaii-as-a-racial-volcano/.

Langton, Elinor. "A White Farmer's Field." *Paradise of the Pacific*. Edited by J. J. Williams. Honolulu, March 1903.

Leask, Nigel. *Curiosity and the Aesthetics of Travel Writing 1770-1840*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Lili'uokalani. *Hawai'i's Story by Hawai'i's Queen.* Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1990.

Linnekin, Jocelyn S. Consuming Cultures: Tourism and the Commoditization of Cultural Identity in the Island Pacific." *Tourism, Ethnicity and the State in Asian and Pacific Studies* edited by Michel Picard and Robert E Wood, 215-250. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997.

Lowe, Ruby Hasegawa. *Kamehameha IV*. U.S.A.: Kamehameha Schools Press, 1997.

Lyons, Paul. *American Pacifism: Oceania in the U.S. Imagination*. New York, Rutledge: 2006.

Mak, James. *Creating "Paradise of the Pacific": How Tourism Began in Hawaii*." Honolulu: The Economic Research Organization at the University of Hawai'i, 2015.

McAvoy, Audrey. "Agency to Hawaii residents: Don't hate on tourists." *Associated Press*. April 25, 2016. http://bigstory.ap.org/article/e4c86f42a0ba4ebeb1d4ba54db8601ba/agency-hawaii-residents-dont-hate-tourists.

McKenzie-Stearns, Precious. *Venturesome Women: Nineteenth-Century British Women Travel Writers and Sport*. PhD dissertation. University of South Florida, 2007.

Moseley, H. N. *Notes by A Naturalist on the "Challenger"*. London: Macmillan and Co, 1879.

Musgrove, Brian. "Travel and Unsettlement: Freud on Vacation." *Travel Writing and Empire: Postcolonial Theory in Transit*. Edited by Steve Clark. New York: Zed Books, 1999.

Nakaso Dan, and B. J. Reyes. "No aloha for Hawaiian shirts at APEC family photo." *Honolulu Star-Advertiser*. Published October 13, 2011. Website. Accessed August 2016. http://www.staradvertiser.com/hawaii-news/no-aloha-for-hawaiian-shirts-at-apec-family-photo/.

Nākuina, Emma Metcalf. *Hawaii: Its People, Their Legends.* Honolulu: Hawaii Promotion Committee, 1904.

Nogelmeier, M. Puakea. *Mai Pa'a I Ka Leo: Historical Voice in Hawaiian Primary Materials, Looking Forward and Listening Back*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 2010.

Ohnuma, Keiko. "'Aloha Spirit' and the Cultural Politics of Sentiment as National Belonging." *The Contemporary Pacific* 20, no. 2 (2008).

Orr, Bridget. "'Stifling Pity in a Parent's Breast: Infanticide and Savagery in Late Eighteenth-century Travel Writing." *Travel Writing and Empire: Postcolonial Theory in Transit*. Edited by Steve Clark. New York: Zed Books, 1999.

Osorio, Jonathan K. *Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002.

Paradise of the Pacific. Edited by J. J. Williams. Honolulu, 1895.

Parker, Frances Stuart. *Francis Stuart Parker: reminiscences and letters.* Chicago: (privately printed), 1907.

Pierce, George F. "Assessing Public Opinion: Editorial Comment and the Annexation of Hawai'i: A Case Study." *Pacific Historical Review* 43, no. 4, 1974.

Poepoe, Joseph M. and George Brown. *Ka Moolelo o ka Moi Kalakaua I*. Honolulu: Hollister & Co., 1891.

Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation.* New York: Routledge, 1992.

Pukui, Mary Kawena and Samuel H. Elbert. *Hawaiian Dictionary.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1986.

Pukui, Mary Kawena. *'Ōlelo No'eau: Hawaiian Proverbs and Poetical Sayings.* Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1983.

Pukui, Mary Kawena, E. W Haertig and Catherine A. Lee. Nānā I Ke Kumu (Look to the Source) Volume II, Honolulu: Hui Hānai, 2002.

Rewi, Poia. *Whaikōrero: The World of Maori Oratory*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2010.

"The Royal Tourist—Kalakaua's Letters Home from Tokio to London." Edited by Richard A. Greer. *Hawaiian Journal of History*, volume 5. 1971.

Sai, Keanu. *Ua Mau Ke Ea Sovereignty Endures: An Overview of the Political and Legal History of Hawai'i.* Honolulu, Pū'ā Foundation, 2011.

Siegel, Kristi. Editor. *Issues in Travel Writing: Empire, Spectacle, and Displacement.* New York: Peter Lang, 2002.

Silva, Noenoe K. *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004.

Silva, Noenoe K. ''I Kū Mau Mau: How Kanaka Maoli Tried to Sustain National Identity Within the United States Political System." *American Studies* 45 no. 3, (2004).

Silva, Noenoe K. "Kū'ē! Hawaiian Women's Resistance to the Annexation." *Social Process in Hawai'i, Women in Hawai'i: Sites, Identities, and Voices* 38, (1997).

Sleeper-Smith, Susan. *Indian Women and French Men: Rethinking Cultural Encounter in the Western Great Lakes*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001.

Skwiot, Christine. *The Purposes of Paradise: U.S. Tourism and Empire in Cuba and Hawai'i.* Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.

Stannard, David E. *Before the Horror: The Population of Hawai'i on the Eve of Western Contact.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1989.

Stevens, John L. and William B. Oleson. *Picturesque Hawaii: A Charming Description of Her Unique History, Strange People, Exquisite Climate, Wondrous Volcanoes, Luxurious Productions, Beautiful Cities, Corrupt Monarchy, Recent Revolution and Provisional Government*. Philadelphia: Hubbard Publishing Company, 1984.

Stevens, John L. and William B. Oleson. *Riches and Marvels of Hawaii: A Charming Description of Her Unique History, Strange People, Exquisite Climate, Wondrous Volcanoes, Luxurious Productions, Beautiful Cities, Corrupt Monarchy, Revolution, Provisional Government and Annexation.* Philadelphia: Edgewood Publishing Company, 1900.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. *In the South Seas*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1900.

Stoddard, Charles Warren. *A Trip to Hawaii*. San Francisco: Oceanic Steamship Co., 1892.

Stoddard, Charles Warren. *A Trip to Hawaii*. San Francisco: Oceanic Steamship Co., 1897.

Stoddard, Charles Warren. *A Trip to Hawaii*. San Francisco: Oceanic Steamship Co., 1901.

Stoddard, Charles Warren. *Hawaiian Life: Being Lazy Letters From Low Latitudes*. Chicago: F. Tennyson Neely, 1894.

Teaiwa, Teresia K. "Bikinis and Other S/Pacific N/Oceans." *The Contemporary Pacific, Volume 6, Number 1, Spring 1994*, Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i Press, (1994).

Third Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society. Honolulu, Hawai'i, 1895.

Thrum, Thomas G. *Hawaiian Almanac and Annual for 1875*. Honolulu: self-published, 1875.

Torgovnick, Marianna. *Gone Primitive: Savage Intellects, Modern Lives.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Tuhiwai Smith, Linda. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples.* New York, NY: Zed Books, 2012.

Trask, Haunani-Kay. *From A Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai'i.* Honoululu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999.

Trask, Haunani-Kay. *Light in the Crevice Never Seen.* Corvallis, Oregon: Calyx Books, 1999.

Trask, Haunani-Kay. *Night Is a Sharkskin Drum*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002.

Turnbull, Phyllis and Kathy E. Ferguson. "Military Presence/Missionary Past: The Historical Construction of Masculine Order and Feminine Hawai'i." *Social Process in Hawai'i: Sites, Identities, and Voices* 38 (1997): 96-107.

Turner, Katherine S. H. "From Classical to Imperial: Changing Visions of Turkey in the Eighteenth Century." *Travel Writing and Empire: Postcolonial Theory in Transit*. Edited by Steve Clark. New York: Zed Books, 1999.

wa Thiong`o, Ngugi. *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature.* Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann, 1986.

Whitney, Henry M. *The Hawaiian Guide Book*. Honolulu: self published, 1875.

Whitney, Henry M. *The Tourists' Guide Through the Hawaiian Islands, Descriptive of Their Scenes and Scenery*. Honolulu: The Hawaiian Gazette's Company Press, 1895.

Wilcox, Bruce A. and Kepā Maly. "Hawaiian Epidemics and Cultural Collapse: A Social-Ecological Perspective." Website. Accessed December 16, 2013.

http://www.hawaii.edu/publichealth/ecohealth/si/course-indighlth/readings/WilcoxandMaly.pdf

Wood, Houston. *Displacing Natives: The Rhetorical Production of Hawai'i.* Boulder: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1999.

Youngs, Tim. *The Cambridge Introduction to Travel Writing.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Nūpepa/Newspapers

"A Leper Governor Gone." in *The Guardian*, vol 23. Edited by Rev. B. Bausman. Philadelphia: The Reformed Church Publication Board, 1877.

"The Aala Park." *The Independent*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 9 October 1896.

"A Strong Course." *The Pacific Commercial Advertiser.* (Honolulu, Hawai'i), December 22, 1897.

"E Lilo Ana O Hawaii Nei I Wahi Makaikai Nui Ia." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 9 April 1925.

"Emma Kaleleonalani Ma Kohala." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 14 October 1882.m

"Famous Priest Dies Following Short Illness." *South Bend News-Times*, (South Bend: Indiana), November 12, 1921.

"Famous Teachers." *The Pacific Commercial Advertiser*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), December 18, 1897.

"Hala Ia Kamaaina a Kanaka Ko'i Ko'i o ka Aina." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), March 28, 1913.

"Hala Ia Kamaaina Kahiko O Honolulu Nei." *Ke Alakai O Hawaii*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 2 Mei 1929.

"Huakai a ke Keiki Alii." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 26 September 1874.

"Huakai Alii ia Hawaii a me Maui." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 21 March 1874.

"Ike Wale Ke Kilauea Ia Molokai." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 10 August 1922.

"Just Published the Hawaiian Guide Book!" *Hawaiian Gazette*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), February 2, 1876.

"Ka Hae Hawaii." *Ke Aloha Aina*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 9 July 1898.

"Ka Huakai A Ka Moi Kalakaua I Kauai." *Nuhou*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 24 March 1874.

"Ka Huakai a ke Keiki Alii." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 3 October 1874.

"Ka Huakai A Ke Keiki Alii." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 31 October 1874.

"Ka Huakai a ke Keiki Alii." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 28 November 1874.

"Ka Huakai a ke Keiki Alii ma Hawaii." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 24 October 1874.

"Ka Huakai a ke keiki Alii ma Hawaii." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 14 November 1874.

"Ka Huakai Alii. [Mai Ko Makou Mea Kakau Manao Kuikawa]." *Ko Hawaii Ponoi*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 15 April 1874.

"Ka Huakai Kaapuni A Ke Keiki Alii Leleiohoku." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa.* (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 5 September 1874.

"Ka Moiwahine Emma Kaleleonalani." *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 14 October 1882.

"Ka nee ana o ka Huakai a ke Keiki Alii." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 12 September 1874.

"Ka Nee Ana O Ka Huakai A Ke Keiki Alii!" *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 26 September 1874.

Kapihenui, M. J. "He Mooolelo No Hiiakaikapoliopele. Helu 7". *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 13 February 1862.

"Ke Kaena A Ka Moi Kalakaua." *Ke Au Hou*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 14 February, 1912.

"Jap and Hawaiian Villages." *The Hawaiian Gazette*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), February 9, 1906.

"Just Published the Hawaiian Guide Book!" *Hawaiian Gazette*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), February 2, 1876.

Kekoa, Edward. "He Kanaka Hawaii Ana Anei Ka Mea Nana E Huki Ka Hae Hawaii Ilalo." *Ke Aloha Aina*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 13 August 1898.

"Ladies' Relief Society." *Evening Bulletin*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 27 September 1895.

"Libraries Use Hawaiian Ad." *The Hawaiian Star*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), April 1, 1904.

"Merchants Indorse The Promotion Committee." *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), October 15, 1904.

"Na Mea Hou o ke Alo Alii." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 14 March 1874.

Nākuina, Emma. "The Women's Relief Society." *Hawaiian Gazette*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), September 10, 1895.

"News in a Nutshell…" *The Hawaiian Star*. (Honolulu: Hawaii), July 25, 1903.

"O Ka Manu Phoenix Ko Ka Lahui Hawaii Hoalike." *Ka Oiaio*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i) 10 August 1894.

"Promoters Are Recipients of Most Novel Idea." *The Honolulu Star-Bulletin*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), September 26, 1913.

"Will Quit the Country: Curator Brigham to Leave for Good." *The Hawaiian Star.* (Honolulu, Hawai'i), July 13, 1897.

"To Boom Hawaii." *The Daily Bulletin*. (Honolulu, Hawaii), October 6, 1892.

"The Hawaiian Relief Society." *Evening Bulletin*. (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 11 November 1895.

"W. B. Oleson Is Called By Death On Health Trip." *Honolulu Star-Bulletin.* (Honolulu, Hawai'i), April 3, 1915.

"William Root Bliss." *New York Tribune.* (New York), April 10, 1906.